Boulder [illegible] Library
HM 106
W554
1903
8,972

COPYRIGHT, 1903, BY
A. C. ARMSTRONG AND SON

Published October, 1903

PREFACE

TO the best of my recollection, it was through the criticism of Christianity by scientists that my attention was first directed to the study of Society, or to what is now called the science of Sociology. From the first somewhat surprised at the character of many of the statements made, I have been led to study science for myself, and especially the sciences of Biology, Ethics and Sociology, as well as to make some slight excursions into the domain of philosophy, with a view to discovering, if possible, the true attitude of the human mind toward the supersensuous. The result, after long years, is in the writing of this little book, which, if not scientific in form, is so, I trust, in its regard for fact, as it certainly is in the convictions and sympathies that have inspired the writing of it.

My hope is, that the following discussion may prove to contain, if not in the facts pre-

sented, at least in the point of view and in the suggested relations of the facts, a substantial contribution to extant scientific knowledge. It is directed to matters that lie along the advancing battle line of human progress, and to people in whose minds the demand for rational conviction tends to outweigh the appeal of tradition or of sentiment.

G. F. WILKIN.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA,
July 1, 1903.

CONTENTS

PREFACE vii

INTRODUCTORY NOTE BY PRESIDENT AUGUSTUS H. STRONG, D.D., LL.D. xi

INTRODUCTION xv

COSMIC CONTROL.

I. THE COSMIC PROCESS 3

II. CONTROL IN GENERAL 8

INDIVIDUAL CONTROL.

III. THE INDIVIDUAL HUMAN BEING AS AN EVOLUTION 27

IV. CONTROL IN THE INDIVIDUAL . . . 37

V. RELATIONS OF RATIONAL WILL TO LOWER FORMS OF CONTROL 44

VI. RELATIONS OF RATIONAL WILL TO OBJECTIVE CONTROL 50

SOCIAL CONTROL.

VII. SOCIETY AS AN EVOLUTION . . . 59

VIII. NATURE OF SOCIAL CONTROL . . . 80

IX. MAINTENANCE OF SOCIAL CONTROL . . 88

X. RELATIONS OF SOCIAL CONTROL TO INDIVIDUAL CONTROL 93

THE SUBVERSION OF CONTROL.

XI. Nature of the Counter-Evolution . 107
XII. Consequences of the Counter-Evolution 121

THE RESTORATION OF CONTROL.

XIII. Evolution the Prevailing Power . . 131
XIV. Some Human Conditions of the Triumph of Evolution 137
XV. The Doctrine of Immortality . . 154
XVI. The Power behind Evolution—Two Theories 178
XVII. The Two Theories Compared . . 186
XVIII. The Practical Test of the Two Theories 215
XIX. Christianity Scientific 236
XX. Conclusion 265
Index 279

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

By Augustus H. Strong, D.D., LL.D., President of Rochester Theological Seminary.

IN the theory of evolution, which has in it so much of value and which has gotten such a hold of the thinking world, there is an important principle not yet worked out. Mr. Herbert Spencer has well shown that each higher order of force, as it emerges, assumes control of those which are lower in rank. The mechanical is dominated by the chemical, the chemical by the vital. By parity of reasoning the rational and voluntary, when it appears upon the scene, should control all the lower orders. Unfortunately Mr. Spencer's understanding of rationality and of freedom is defective, and little is made of these but a new manifestation of biological force. His system therefore remains a torso, a trunk without head to rule or arms to apply.

Christianity can make use of all the truth

of evolution without giving up any of its peculiar teachings. It can do more than this, —it can show itself to be the only key to the secret of the universe, and the proper supplement to all that natural science can teach. Free will is the only natural outcome and climax of the process. But free will involves possibilities of deterioration and of counter-evolution. Darwin has pointed out that, in the lower spheres, myriads of species perish in order that the fittest may survive. A few evolutionists, like Lankester, have given whole treatises to the subject of degeneration. But few have recognized that in the highest sphere—the sphere of rationality and freedom—there is an even more startling, because a conscious and voluntary, failure to attain the high ends which nature sets before her progeny. Evolutionists in general have ignored many most important facts of man's moral and spiritual life, because they have not grasped the fundamental fact that man is a moral and spiritual being.

Dr. Wilkin, in the following treatise, has given us, in my judgment, an important application and supplement to the evolutionary

doctrine, by showing the nature and applications of the principle of rational and voluntary control. That it fits in with the teachings of evangelical religion should not blind scientific men to the light which it throws upon their own investigations. An evolutionary philosophy without personal and omniscient control is insensate in the extreme. As the method of a personal God, it is not only intelligible but convincing. But when we once accept a theistic solution to the problems of creation, we find that the Sacred Scriptures assume a new rationality. Sin and redemption, respectively, are but the abnormal and the normalized evolution of humanity, and immortality is its necessary goal and crown. I am confident that our author has in this work done much to put science and religion at rights with one another, and to give the Christian faith a new hold upon all thoughtful men.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.,
September 1, 1903.

INTRODUCTION

DESPITE an ambiguity in meaning and for want of a better terminology, the expression "social control" has been set apart and devoted by usage of sociologists to the naming of three several facts: First, civil government; secondly, the "regulating" or dominant and directing element and function in general in society; and, thirdly, the force or agency, or whatever it be, that proximately determines the existence of a progressive social order. In the first and second senses it designates particular phenomena of society; in the third sense, society itself is the phenomenon contemplated, not indeed in general, but with special reference to its formative and plastic principle —the principle by virtue of which society *is*, and is what it is. The following discussion concerns only this last meaning of the expression.

My *aim* is to get at the *facts* that constitute social control. Recognizing in society both statical and dynamical conditions—both a necessary Order and a necessary Progress—I desire to indicate wherein the essential nature of that order and that progress consist; meantime, however, having special reference to the means by which they are to be conserved and promoted.

The point of view from which I approach the subject is, therefore, scientific. Science is the knowledge of fact. But it differs from the ordinary knowledge of unthinking people in that it is a specially careful and discriminating knowledge. It is characterized by a conscious analytical recognition of the complex nature of the cognitive act; by its attempt to define the relations subsisting between the subjective and the objective elements of knowledge; and by its exclusion from the category of knowledge of all that is merely subjective, or that, by reason of its nature, is necessarily and forever beyond the possibility of verification. It repudiates, therefore, all *a priori* ontological speculation; eschews everything of a merely metaphysical

nature; and lays no claim to any immediate apprehension of the spiritual realities—as God and the human soul—postulated by religion; and postulated also, as some of the masters of thought maintain, by philosophy.

Nevertheless, speculation and religious opinions and dogmas and the teaching of sacred books, whether true or false, that have figured in history, contributing to shape the destinies of men, or that are now influencing human thought and action, when viewed objectively, are fact, and are thus material for science; and they are especially important facts relative to a scientific discussion of the nature and progress of human society. And science itself—or a scientific philosophy—proceeding from the observable phenomena of existence, may attain to an assured faith in that which transcends experience; while some of the broad and frequented highways of experience may furnish us the materials for a knowledge, hitherto unrecognized by science, as profound as any that bears the mark of science, and nearer perchance to the eternal verities than the experience philosophy is wont to venture.

The true *starting point* for a scientific study of any social problem is in a cosmic philosophy. We know a subject thoroughly only when we have traced it to its remotest origins, and have located it with reference to its total environment. The doctrine of Evolution, broached in its zoölogical application by Lamarck, later improved by Darwin, and enlarged to a true cosmic philosophy by Comte and Spencer, furnishes such a basis for the scientific study of society. And the general acceptance of that doctrine by scholars sufficiently warrants the use of it as the foundation of my argument without more ado, and with no other explanations than the peculiar nature of my topic may from time to time demand.

It is, however, important for my argument to explain, that by "cosmic philosophy" and by evolution regarded as a "philosophy" of the cosmos, I understand, not strictly a philosophy, in the traditional sense of the term, but something more properly designated as science: since the cosmic philosophy is in fact a coördination and cosmic unification of the sciences; or, perhaps better, it is an attempt

at the systematic exposition of the sum total of human knowledge.

The great problem of philosophy in modern times has been to analyze the cognitive act, and to ascertain the nature and the limitations of human knowledge, as these are to be discovered in the mind itself, by a contemplation of its activities. Such is philosophy in the writings of DesCartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel. It does not presuppose any great development of natural science ; and, as a matter of fact, most of these philosophers wrote at a time when a great majority of the sciences now extant were as yet unborn.

But when we come to the "Philosophie Positive" of Comte, the "Synthetic Philosophy" of Spencer, and the "Cosmic Philosophy" of Fiske, the great problem is no longer the nature and limitations of knowledge, but the coördination and unification of knowledge, or the formulation of a *science* of the sciences. (See Spencer's "First Principles," Part II, Ch. I, Sec. 37 ; and Fiske's "Cosmic Philosophy," 16th Ed., Vol. I, Ch. II.)

In making Evolution the basis of my argument, therefore, I am not in any sense transcending science. I am rather simply conforming to the imperative requirements of an up-to-date scientific discussion—setting out from the generally received doctrines of current scientific thought. That the leading exponents of such doctrines choose to characterize them as philosophical, is matter of indifference, provided we understand that they employ the term philosophy in this peculiarly modern sense, as a name for the generalization of the sciences.[1]

The order of thought in the following discussion will be, first, Control in General, as it appears in the cosmic process as a whole; secondly, Control in the Individual Human Being; thirdly, Control in Society—these three titles having reference to control in its

[1] The above remarks are not to be understood as in any sense derogatory to the philosophy proper, emanating from these late writers. Spencer, especially, has enunciated a philosophy characterized by so judicious a sifting and coördination of the results of previous thought, and by so keen and discriminating an insight into the nature of human experience and knowledge, and withal so admirably concise and luminous in statement, as easily to entitle him to a place in the front rank of philosophers.

normal character. Control abnormal will be discussed in, fourthly, The Counter-Evolution; while the mutual relations of normal and abnormal control, together with the practical outcome, will constitute the subject-matter of the fifth general division, entitled Evolution Remedial.

COSMIC CONTROL

Control in Evolution

CHAPTER I

The Cosmic Process

THE nature of control in general, or in its essential character, dissociated from special characteristics belonging to transitory and partial phases of control, may be gathered from a survey of the evolutionary movement as a whole.

Evolution has been defined by its ablest exponent as "an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity, and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation."

This technical language, which to an unscientific reader would probably at first be mere jargon, will be found to improve with acquaint-

ance. Without attempting a complete exposition, for which one should consult Spencer's "First Principles" or Fiske's "Cosmic Philosophy," I will merely suggest an outline of the leading facts characterized by the definition, in so far as they constitute a necessary basis for my own argument.

From a study of nebulæ and other celestial phenomena astronomers have discovered what seem to be worlds, or systems of worlds, in process of formation; and they conclude that the solar system, including our earth, together with all other systems, was at one time in the almost infinite past in the form of a thin nebula, consisting of ultimate uncompounded atoms of matter dispersed indefinitely and perhaps uniformly throughout space, every atom being endowed with a vibratory motion.

From this primitive state of "indefinite, incoherent homogeneity," there gradually arose the beginnings of a vast order. Under the operation of the force we call gravitation, the atoms of matter began to come together, or to "integrate," and to revolve about various centres, in the meantime becoming incandescent with an inconceivable heat, produce

by the integration of the atomic motions in combination with the cosmic movements and the impact of atom on atom. As the atoms gradually "dissipated" their motion, through their union together, the revolving nebulæ cooled and contracted, and threw off one revolving mass after another, each of which under the force of gravitation took an approximately globular form, and on cooling sufficiently became a planet, after having itself, however, in the process thrown off in most instances one or more masses of matter that became satellites or moons. The remaining central mass, of vastly greater volume, continued incandescent and became the central sun of the planetary system.

When the planets had cooled sufficiently and had become coherent in their material constitution, a new process of integration came into view, by which the atoms were united into the various combinations and characters which we call chemical; and so the solid substance of the earth was compounded.

Again a period of cooling and contraction and of the operation of the elements, prepared the way for the introduction of a still higher

integration of matter, with a still more "definite and coherent heterogeneity," or differentiation, of structure and function; namely, for the introduction of living things, vegetable and animal, by which the earth was clothed with verdure and peopled with moving creatures.

Last and highest of the animals came man, distinguished from all before him by the superior delicacy and refinement of his animal organism, and by his rational nature, to which his body is adapted and subordinated as a fit instrument.

Human society, or the collective life of mankind, constitutes the last stage of evolution.

Without further explanation, we notice that the process of world building, as thus outlined, admits of division into four periods, corresponding to as many distinct aspects of the development. The first period, characterized by the physical integration of elementary atoms and the formation of the cosmos, by the operation of *gravitation*, had virtually closed when the *chemical* period began. And this, in turn, had substantially completed the

compounding process when *life* appeared. And the latest form of life was *man*.

These periods, however, are not to be conceived of as separated by distinct boundaries, much less by cataclysmic gaps, as was once supposed, but as blending imperceptibly into one another by the secular operation of natural forces; as being, therefore, in reality, largely coëxistent; and as being consecutive only in a broad and general view and with reference to the highest and characteristic forms of their several modes of progressive activity.

Moreover, it is by no means to be understood that these four periods are the only periods, and that the characters represented by them are the only characters, traceable in the evolution of the cosmos. The divisions might easily be made more numerous. But I have chosen the fourfold view as bringing out into distinct relief the grand outline of the world process, and as being not too cumbersome for my purpose.

CHAPTER II

Control in General

IN proposing the inquiry as to what it is that *determines* the order and the progress of society, the idea is not primarily to seek out the ultimate creative or causal reality; but rather to note those proximate facts, which, lying within the sphere of human observation or investigation, are so numerous and so uniform and so related to other facts, that all men, learned as well as ignorant, naturally regard them as *characteristic* of the several epochs in which they appear. So now, in speaking of cosmic control, the aim is to discover the nature and some obvious relations of the characteristic facts of cosmic evolution noted in chapter one, but without assigning to them any casual efficiency or passing any judgment as to the causes of the phenomena. The question of ultimate causation will, however, necessarily be considered later in connection with certain social and

ethical systems based on differing theories of causation—systems that figure very largely in the control of society, and that fall therefore within the purview of this discussion.

Control, regarded thus as a cosmic phenomenon, may be *defined*, in general, as a uniform tendency to order and progress. And the specific nature of the control, in any particular case, will be determined by the nature of the order and the progress attained, or to be attained.

1. There are *four species of control* distinctly apparent in evolution, answering to the four periods of the cosmic process.

The controlling principle of the first period is the tendency of all particles and integrations of matter to approach one another with a force proportional to mass and inversely proportional to the square of the distance—a fact to which the name *gravitation* is given.

While gravitation does not disappear, but remains in force, it ceases to be the most conspicuous and characteristic principle as the first period closes; and with the beginning of the second period *chemical affinity* becomes the great controlling force.

In like manner, *life* is the predominant and controlling fact of the third period.

In the fourth period the supreme control is to be found in man, and, naturally, in that which distinguishes man from the brute creation, and is characteristic—namely, his rational nature. But since control is an active determination to some certain static or dynamic end, and since the active principle in man is the will, we may characterize control in the human period of evolution as the dominance of the *rational will*, or practical reason, of man.

2. These four species of control *constitute a progression.* The order in which they occur is not indifferent and fortuitous, but natural and necessary. The later form in each case presupposes the earlier, and, as the world is constituted, could not have existed save under conditions provided by the virtual completion of the work of each and every previous form of control. Gravitation, by reason of its simplicity and independence of other forms, is naturally first. Chemical affinity, as working for the most part at minute distances, presupposes the integrating action of gravitation

bringing the material within its reach. Life subsists mainly upon chemically compounded matter, and could not subsist wholly upon elementary substances. Animal life requires vegetable or animal nutriment; and, so far as our experience goes, the human mind demands an animal mechanism—nay, the most perfect of animal mechanisms—as the instrument of its activity.

And, since the later control is in no case necessary to the earlier—since the order of dependence is never reversed, and cannot be —it is plain that cosmic control exhibits no mere succession of coördinate elements, but a progression of elements rising step by step in complexity, and consequently in dignity and importance, until the last appears, most complex and highest of all.

3. *Each later species of control enters the territory of its predecessor as an invader and conqueror*; subjugating it and making it subservient to its own later and higher functions. Seizing upon the atoms comfortably ensconced in the aggregates where gravitation had placed them, and overcoming the resistance of their inertia by its own superior power, chemical

affinity forces them into new combinations, imposes upon them new functions, and makes them useful in new and unheard-of ways, according to its own pleasure. Life does the same by chemical compounds; and the last comer, man, imposes his will upon the entire range of animate and inanimate nature—lord and master of all, and subjugating all to the furtherance of his own rational purposes.

This conception of the relations of the different species of control does not, however, imply a judgment as to their origin. It is true that they are different; that they are cosmically consecutive; that the later species come with the assertion of royal prerogative, with an aggressive initiative, and with power to subdue and subject their predecessors. But in all this we behold merely the *facts* of their external and phenomenal relations, and no suggestion whatever as to their origin, save in the general sense in which all phenomena may be said to suggest always and inevitably the corresponding noumena. It is not necessary to suppose that the introduction of each new order of phenomena signifies the impartation to the cosmos of a previously non-exis-

tent element—the creation of something out of nothing by an extra-cosmic power. So far as appears, the various forms of control may all have been implicit in the primitive atoms of matter, and may have risen from dormancy to an observable activity when the changing conditions of the cosmic process furnished them a favoring environment. This is certainly as conceivable as the development of a Gladstone from an apparently characterless protoplasmic cell.

4. The several species of control, while in complexity, dignity, and power constituting an increasing series, *constitute*, on the other hand, *a decreasing series as to the extent and amount of their direct physical efficiency.*

As to the *extent of the domain* in which they operate, from gravitation, filling all space, we descend abruptly to chemical force, limited for the most part to physical aggregations of matter, as the planetary bodies; and, again abruptly, to the superficial area of these bodies, where alone life is found; and, lastly, in man the direct physical action of control disappears altogether, since rational will acts directly only on the physical organism in

which it dwells, and that by purely psychical influences.

In the *amount of physical force* directly displayed there is again the rapid descent from gravitation, which integrates and sustains worlds and cosmic systems, to chemical affinity, which, though practically irresistible in its narrow range, is not like gravitation beyond the possibility of question as to resistance; and, as to the total force displayed, the disproportion is rather greater than less than that of their respective domains. The physical force of the vital principle is displayed chiefly in such comparatively insignificant operations as the raising and sustaining of vegetable and animal organisms against the force of gravitation. In rational will, as above noted, physical force entirely disappears.

The dominance of the later forms of control results, therefore, *not from superior physical force*, for in physical force they are inferior; but from a superior quality that more than counterbalances physical inferiority. In its latest stage, as Fiske has explained ("Cosmic Philosophy," 16th Ed., II, 321), evolution

has ceased to be physical and has become psychical, and now the power that determines it is the power of rational will, which is Mind uncorrelated with matter, and which, in its connection with the physical nature of man and its indirect compassing of physical results in the external world thereby, is, and is liable forever to remain, an inscrutable mystery.

5. From the decreasing area of the later stages of control it results that there is for each earlier form of control *a residuary sphere* in which it retains its controlling authority, and with which the later forms do not and cannot intermeddle. The predominance of gravitation can never be disturbed in the interstellar spaces, nor in the control of material masses. No power of life or of mind can prevent or control the operation of chemical forces when the conditions are favorable, as in the building of the tissues of the body or in the changes taking place in the deep laboratory of subterranean heat. Vital functions, also, have their own sanctuary, and he who ventures to profane it finds himself in the abode of death, not life.

The advancing movement and changing character of control in its first three stages has served two distinct ends: First, by the rapidly converging lines of supreme effort in successive orders of control it has achieved its masterpiece, the *human body*—worthy instrument of a still higher order of control; and, secondly, by the less rapidly converging lines of ordinary activity it has furnished an *environment* offering, by its various characters and its differing degrees of evolution, a worthy domicile and ample employment and opportunity of culture for man.

6. The operation of control, which is that of evolution itself, is an *accelerating movement.* Gravitation did not perform its work with the rapidity characteristic of the rational will of man. On the contrary, it was inconceivably slow in its action. Uncounted eons of time were consumed in gathering the dispersed atoms of matter into the nuclei of systems; in the cooling and contraction of the incandescent masses; and in the ejection and formation of the planetary bodies. Vastly less—we might almost say, infinitely less—was the time requisite for the further cooling and the

chemical compounding of one of the smaller of these relatively minute planetary bodies. The period of life falls within a time of which we can form some vague comparative conception—the time spanned by geologic science; while the period of man is so recent as to be almost postgeologic, and so brief as to constitute hardly more than a mathematical point in comparison with even the shortest of preceding periods.

It is a mistake, therefore, to measure human history by the time standards of geology. It is immeasurably more rapid in its movement. And it would not be strange if its hastening pace were to be measured at last even by years, rather than by milleniums or centuries.

7. It is of the utmost importance to note that the *controlling principle of evolution at the present time is the rational will of man*. What gravitation once was for a certain stage of evolution; what chemical affinity was for a later and higher stage; what life was for a still more advanced period; that the practical reason of man now is—the supreme controlling principle of the world, in the sense of control which this discussion contemplates.

The importance of this observation lies partly in the fact that sociologists have generally practically ignored the truth it contains. Herbert Spencer, for example, who is on the whole the greatest exponent of sociology, has given us a biological sociology, explaining the phenomena of society by the analogies and laws of animal life, and practically denying the power of the human will to modify the evolution of society to any considerable degree. It would be precisely as reasonable to explain chemistry by the laws of physics, or life by chemical analogies. A *new power* has come into the world with the dawn of human reason. And, while there is life in man, and a residuary domain subject to biological laws, there is also a residuary domain subject to chemical laws, as in the digestion of food ; and another subject to the laws of physics, as in the muscular control of the skeleton. But the *supreme control of all*, regulating and directing all the rest, at its own motion and with a view to its own distinctive ends, is the control of the *rational human will*—latest and highest form of evolutionary force. The existence of this force is self-evident; the laws of its

operation we shall consider in a subsequent chapter.

8. Cosmic control, characteristic principle and mirror of the evolutionary process, *is a unity*. Evolution is nowhere a random and disorderly movement. It is always an orderly and coherently progressive movement, from the beginning to the present time. Having different characters at different times, due not to breaks in the forward movement but to long continued variations, these characters all blend into one current of progressive order. And we always mean this when we speak of evolution. We do not need explicitly to assert the unity of our conception. It is implied, as a matter of course, in the admitted and alleged fact of evolution.

An inference from this unity of evolution will inevitably spontaneously arise in the mind of every thoughtful human being: there must be a Unit Power that has *caused* this wonderful unity of movement. The thought comes to me. It comes to you. It comes to all whose minds rest upon the problem. We may banish it by an effort of will, but it returns. We may banish it by a philosophical

system that denies the possibility of our knowing any such thing as objective reality, as the Skepticism of Hume; or that virtually denies, by ignoring, the conception as of no practical importance, as the Positivism of Comte:—but the thought returns. It will not down. It is one of the permanent facts of our inner consciousness—one of the constant elements in the control of the individual and collective life of man.

This great noumenal Cause, in its essential nature unknown to us, which we assume to be the source of all the phenomenal forms of the cosmos and of cosmic control, must be something more than the reality underlying the phenomena of gravitation, which accounts for only a portion, and that the most elementary portion, of cosmic phenomena;—more than the noumenal fact of which chemical affinity is a manifestation, for a similar reason;—and, for a like reason, more than the essential verity giving rise to the phenomena of life:—more than all three, for all three are inadequate to the total result. Superadded to all these, it must also be competent to the creation of rational personalities of the nature of

man. But the stream does not rise higher than its source—the creator of intelligent beings must be an intelligent personality. Or,—contingency contemplated by science,—it must be an eternally existent atomic force —a force residing in the ultimate atoms of matter, the atoms containing thus, as in embryo, the potentiality of all evolution, even to its rational stage. One or the other modern thought declares it must be—Theism or Naturalism. The human mind in its pursuit of truth cannot rest short of the ultimate; and in its conception of atomic force, no less than in the idea of God, it has definitely given expression to the conviction, inalienable from humanity, that behind the cosmic unity of the Apparent there is ever the One Unseen Reality, mysterious, inscrutable, the final Source and potent Cause of all things outside itself.

We have seen the nature of the cosmic process:—that it is a gradually progressing orderly development, advancing successively through physical, chemical, vital, and rational stages—stages, however, that are not separated by definitely marked boundaries, but that

blend, like the colors of the rainbow, into the unity of a single uninterrupted movement. We have noticed the nature, in general, of the control characterizing these phenomena:—that it has, corresponding to the periods of evolution, four characters, which we designate as gravitation, chemical affinity, vital force, and rational will; but without attributing efficiency of any sort to them, and regarding them merely as the modes in which some mysterious Force behind the cosmic process expresses itself.

We have seen that these four modes of cosmic control constitute a progression, as to the complexity and dignity of the operations determined by them; that the later forms enter the domain of the earlier as active aggressors, subduing and transforming it, and imparting to it their own newer and higher character; that this advance is achieved, in spite of a marked inferiority of physical force in the later control, and by virtue of a superiority in the quality of the force; that the domain of the later forms is in each case narrower than the domain of the earlier; that there is, thus, a residuary sphere in which the

earlier control retains its authority; that cosmic control is an accelerating movement; and that the form it now has is, not that of some mysterious cosmic force operating upon man from without and determining his destiny in spite of anything he can do, but it is the rational will of man himself.

And we have seen that this control, which, from the point of view of the universe, we may denominate subjective, must be conceived of as the effect of some objective efficiency or causal principle, whose activity produces these phenomena of cosmic control; and that this objective efficiency, so far as we have yet seen, may be either naturalistic or theistic. It may be either an Atomic Force or a Personal God.

I shall assume from this point that cosmic control, as above outlined, is normal evolutionary control, and that its principles are of general applicability in any and all phases of the world-process. That this assumption is not violent, but necessary, is, I think, evident from the fact that the doctrine enunciated is an almost self-evident interpretation of the world-process itself, and is evident from the

self-consistency and uniformity of nature's laws. I shall, however, employ these principles merely as a clue to plain paths, and not for the establishment of doubtful positions, bearing ever in mind the aim set before us at the first—to eschew speculation, and to discuss *facts*. And the facts to which I shall chiefly advert lie, not within the shadowy border-land of the unknown, but within the familiar haunts of human experience,—the proper domain of science.

INDIVIDUAL CONTROL

CHAPTER III

The Individual Human Being as an Evolution

IN the foregoing chapters we noted some of the characteristics of rational will conceived of as part of a larger whole. We observed that man is the last and highest product of evolution, and that rational will, man's distinguishing characteristic, is the last term of a growing and complicating system of cosmic control. Now we take it up analytically, discussing, first, man as an evolution; and, secondly, rational will as control in the individual. This chapter will be occupied with man as an evolution.

Aside from the cosmic process, by which, through the integrations of gravitation, the transformations of chemistry, and the changes wrought in the mysterious alembic of life, the material and the mode of existence of the human body were prepared;—aside from the biologic development by which the primordial

protoplasmic germ rose from the simple amœba through all the ascending stages of animal existence till it culminated in man ;—aside from the process of gestation, in which the individual passes through a similar gradual ascent from the lowest to the highest of animal forms, assuming its proper human character only as it approaches birth :—over and above these various aspects of evolution that interweave the life of man inextricably with all the past of mundane existence, there is a true *post-natal* evolution in the experience of every human being, and also a *historic* progress in the character of the development of individuals that itself amounts to a true evolution.

1. The individual is an evolution *physically*. From the time when, a helpless infant, it is merely an object of care, it gradually gains the control of its members, learning to drink, eat, creep, walk, talk. Growing, meanwhile, the proportions and contour of the body change in the interest of efficient activity and self-mastery, until, in the neighborhood of twenty-five years of age, man attains the fully developed maturity of his physical powers.

2. The individual is an evolution *intellectually*. From infancy, the zero point in man's knowledge of himself and of the world he lives in, he advances by a twofold process; first, to self-consciousness: to the knowledge of his own nature, powers, responsibilities, and destiny; and, secondly, to acquaintance with his environment. This, it should be observed, is progress from immaturity to maturity; from an undeveloped to a normal humanity. The period of man's intellectual maturity is much later than that of his highest physical development; but, if it be united with a vigorous physique, there seems to be no reason why it should not be progressive till the end of life.

3. Man is an evolution *morally*. That is to say, he is an evolution relative to self-determined rightness of living. In infancy man can hardly be said to be a moral being, save potentially. He is wholly passive, acting only in response to instinctive impulses, and in the reception of that which maternal care provides. But, as he advances to self-consciousness, he becomes aware of two things:—first, that certain acts are wrong, and

certain other acts are right—that some things *ought* to be done, and some other things *ought not* to be done ; and, secondly, that *he himself is responsible* for doing the right and for shunning the wrong.

There are, accordingly, two lines along which man develops morally :—first, he advances in the knowledge of *moral ideals ;* and, secondly, he progresses from the determination of his action by the will of others toward rational *self-determination.*

(1) *Man progresses in the knowledge of moral ideals.* This progress may be said to be twofold :—including, first, a growing apprehension of traditional standards of morality ; and, secondly, an advance from traditional to rational standards. As a matter of fact, comparatively few people ever advance beyond the traditional stage of moral development. The instructions of parents and teachers, followed in childhood with unthinking obedience, are later adopted with intelligent recognition of their beneficence. Happily, the current principles of theoretical morality approximate to ideal excellence ; and the practical evils of industrial, political, and social life may very

well find an antidote in the universal dissemination of these principles.

And yet a traditional morality never can be ultimate. Even though the standards coming to us from the past by the laws of inheritance be approximately ideal; yet the mind of man never can rest in them, and never can attain to a perfectly unbiassed and symmetrical moral view, till it has cut itself off from all connection with the past, and stands alone face to face with the moral order of the universe. The independent *rational* apprehension of man's place and function in the cosmos, is ultimate morality. And, although a traditional morality is indispensable in the training of children, and inseparable from the moral immaturity of adults; yet, in the growing tendency, observable in these times, to break away from the restraints of tradition, and to formulate anew on rational principles our ethical standards, we behold, not merely an antinomian restlessness under moral restraints, but especially, I think, a natural and necessary striving of the human mind after its ultimate moral self-realization.

(2) *Man progresses from determination by*

the will of others to rational self-determination. The babe is determined; the mature man determines himself to action, toward rational ends, and by rational principles. Some philosophers deny human freedom, and tell us that every decision we make, like every phenomenon in the material universe, is an inevitable resultant of the sum total of antecedent forces, and could not be other than it is —a single link in an all-embracing "causal chain." If those philosophers could establish beyond a peradventure (as they have not done, and, from the nature of the case, cannot do) the correlation of mind with matter and with physical force, their opinion would be unassailable. As the case stands, however, this opinion, in common with all metaphysical speculation, must borrow whatever of plausibility it may possess from its harmony with the facts of the phenomenal universe. And so, while not undertaking any extended discussion of the subject, I will simply note some characteristic facts in the progress of the human individual from infancy to maturity—facts that philosophy itself must recognize.

The cause that determines changes for the

babe is *without him*, in another human being's rational will; that which determines the adult to action is *within him*, in his own rational will—and that whatever the will itself may be said to be. And this transfer of the volitional cause from without to within a man is accompanied by a transfer of the sense of moral responsibility. The parents recognize their responsibility for the unconscious child; but the child, become normally a man, becomes consciously responsible for himself—for his own decisions and actions—for ordering all his conduct in accordance with the dictates of a right reason. This progressive assumption of responsibility and of rational self-direction, is always an element in the moral evolution of the individual. And it is this phenomenon which we denominate freedom. It is incontrovertibly a fact, however it may be explained philosophically. And it is a fact directly in line with the purpose of this discussion—a fact relative to control, or the determination of conduct. And this fact will not, I think, be called in question: for the objections raised against the doctrine of freedom are mostly directed against the conception of an arbitrary

or lawless power—a power independent of motives, and operating on no fixed and certain principles. And this, whatever else it may or may not be, freedom certainly is not. But, just as certainly, freedom *is* a determination of self to action on rational principles and by rational motives.

The ethical evolution of the individual presupposes the intellectual evolution. If the advance from childhood to a physical manhood is marked by no corresponding unfolding of intelligence—if the adult in body remains an infant in mind—there is no moral development. The ideal ethical evolution supposes the individual to have attained a complete scientific conception of human life in all its relations; or, in other words, a complete knowledge of rightness in living. The ethical stage of evolution is thus later and higher than the intellectual stage.

4. There is a *historical development* of the individual, which, there is evidence to show, is both physical and intellectual, but is especially ethical, in that it involves a marked advance in the apprehension of right ideals by the individual, as a man and as a member

of society, and also a decided progress from determination by others to self-determination —*a development from infancy to maturity in the race* quite parallel to that which takes place from childhood to manhood in the individual.

This secular evolution of the individual is traceable chiefly in connection with political ideas. In the great nations of antiquity—Egypt, Assyria, Babylon—the citizen was the mere servile tool of an absolute despotism. In Greece and Rome the flame of human freedom flashed forth for a time, but uncertainly and fitfully as a class privilege founded on a system of caste. Almost smothered from the first by an overtowering militancy; by the enslavement, always of a large element, at times even of a majority, of the inhabitants; by the power and unrestrained license of a wealthy aristocracy; and by the gross ignorance, poverty, and moral degradation of a great majority of the population;—it went out at last in blood. But American citizenship is based upon a legal and a popular recognition of the "inalienable rights" of *Man*. The change for the individual from

antiquity to the present time is a change from subjection to the arbitrary all-dominating will of a despot, to a joint partnership in a nation of sovereigns. And with the private interests of the sovereign no stranger intermeddles. With respect to these, the rights of other sovereigns being honored, he is wholly determined by the dictates of his own rational will. In other words, he is a free man.

CHAPTER IV

Control in the Individual.

RECOLLECTING that control is that which proximately determines something to be what it is, we are speedily aware that, the preliminary forms of cosmic control aside, rational will is not the only important factor in the control of the human individual. As an evolution, man obviously has a *threefold character*, and thus three corresponding species of control. These are, first, the *animal appetites and passions;* secondly, the *intellect;* thirdly, the *rational will.* I will first notice the true subordination and mutual relations of these modes of control among themselves, as they are ascertained by the application of the general principles enunciated under the head of Cosmic Control; and then indicate the precise nature of the authority of the rational will, and some of the relations of rational will to the lower forms of cosmic control and to the

Objective Control determining the evolutionary process as a whole.

1. The various forms of control in the individual, like those in the cosmos, are so related to one another as to *constitute a progression.* Man being an animal having a distinct existence in time prior to the endowment of this animal with a rational and ethical nature, the animal appetites and passions are the earliest, and as such the lowest in authority, of the three species of individual control. As, further, intellectual activity is presupposed in the ethical, in so much that a man may be intellectual without being moral—a fact illustrated in the intellectual greatness of many men like Machiavelli or Napoleon, in whom the ethical element was sadly wanting—the control of the intellect is anterior to that of the rational will, and lower in the scale.

The *normal man,* therefore, is the man whose intellect dominates his animal nature, and whose ethical will dominates both the animal nature and the intellect, and subordinates them to the active pursuit of the ideal Right.

2. The later forms of control, in the individual as in the cosmos, do not simply enter

and assert their right to *exist* alongside the earlier; they *come as conquerors*, demanding the submission of their predecessors, and asserting the prerogative of a master to exact the active coöperation of their predecessors in the pursuit of their own higher ends. The advent of intellect means that the animal appetites and passions are no longer their own masters, but are the servants of intellect, for the achieving of an intellectual destiny *alone*, and not at all henceforth for mere animal gratification. And so when rational will takes the throne, mere intellectual self-indulgence is no longer in place, but the whole man is subordinated to the active pursuit of the supreme ethical goal of an evolutionary life.

3. In individual control, as in cosmic, there is a *progessive narrowing of the field of direct efficiency* from stage to stage. The intellect does not undertake to dictate all physical functions, and still less does the rational will dictate all the operations of the animal and intellectual life. But, of the sum total of our individual activities, the intellect actively originates only the intellectual and the rational will only the ethical, the later control

in each case retaining only a supervisory and regulative authority over its predecessors. Thus, as the dignity of the office enhances, there is possible a superior concentration of power and efficiency in the administration.

4. In individual control, as in cosmic, it results from the narrowing territory of the later stages that there is, for each earlier and lower form of control, a *residuary sphere*, in which it retains its direct controlling authority, and with which the later control does not and cannot interfere. The animal instincts of hunger and thirst assert their prerogative with as great and as convincing authority as any higher impulse of our nature; and the scientific dicta of the human intellect are as truly sovereign in their sphere as are the judgments of the practical reason in the sphere of ethics.

The earlier control is in each case ultimate so far as it goes, and there is no disregarding its demands; but it is not the highest or final control. It does not indicate the supreme destination and nature of man. And the higher control of the practical reason comes in, not to eliminate or to repress the lower forms; but to give to them direction in ac-

cordance with the highest ends, to moderate and regulate their operation into harmony with those ends, and thus by its own supreme authority to secure the symmetrical development of man in all his powers from highest to lowest.

5. Most remarkable is the *acceleration of movement* from stage to stage of individual control. The animal impulses, operating through years, gradually make or unmake a man, according as they are normally cultivated or abnormally indulged. The mind, while operating oftentimes with lightning speed, yet finds that, in proportion as the results aimed at are great and important, it must proceed with deliberation, and establish its conclusions with careful analysis, verification, and comparison of data. But the will, if once the intellectual preliminaries of a decision are past, acts *instantly*. And by the decision of an instant it may not only *change*, it may *revolutionize*, the whole life.

It is antecedently obvious, indeed, that, as the will is the supreme control of human life in its entirety and finality, an important change in the will is an equally important change in the whole trend of the life; and a radical re-

versal of the will is *ipso facto* a revolution in the life. The *character* is transformed instantly, though the results in outward conduct only gradually appear, as the ship answers gradually to the helm. It is a familiar fact, that the decision of the instant, when the answer, "I will," was given to the tempter or to the call of duty, has not infrequently been the final wrecking or the final making of a man.

It is, however, true that our decisions are ordinarily a natural expression, as well as a determination, of character; and only a long-continued perseverance in the cultivation of *rational* self-determination or an extraordinary combination of circumstances, will enable a man to rise superior to the biological inheritance of constitutional and habitual tendency and to direct his footsteps in accordance with an untrammelled face to face fellowship with the True and the Right. Much easier it usually is, by a single base choice, to undo the achievements of years of endeavor and to precipitate one's self into the depths of a moral and social perdition.

This baneful possibility should emphasize to us, not only the dangers of rational self-

determination in its unsettled beginnings, but especially the transcendent importance of rising above its feebler stages, and of attaining to the complete mastery of our ethical will over every impulse, habit, and tendency of our nature—of achieving, that is to say, not alone a physical and intellectual maturity, but especially a manhood that is normal in the completeness and strength of its morality.

The possibility of such attainment lies in the fact that human nature is at bottom and essentially evolutionary. And this means that our higher powers, in their normal operation, are mightier than our lower powers. Rational will is mightier than the animal appetites and passions. And not only so :—the Sovereign Power of evolution, that has ordained the normal course and character of human life, is in league with the man who walks in that path, giving to him an abounding enlargement of all his faculties, insomuch that the lower interests and indulgencies of life lose for him their exceeding charm ; and his thought, his faith, his hope, his love, his all, leaps forth joyously enthusiastic toward the high and holy End of living.

CHAPTER V

Relations of Rational Will to Lower Forms of Control

RATIONAL will is the last and highest form of control in cosmic evolution. It is, therefore, dominant over all. But the distinctive nature of rational will gives to this dominance a peculiar character, first, relative to the human body; secondly, relative to our material environment.

1. Rational will differs from all the earlier forms of cosmic control, in that it *operates indirectly upon its object.* Gravitation, chemical affinity, and life, have wrought their part of the evolutionary process by direct action in and upon matter. The mind and will of man, on the contrary, never act, so far as we know, directly upon matter in general, or upon the minds of other men, but *only upon one's own body, and through the body*, upon the bodies and minds of others, and upon sub-rational nature.

Into this body, prepared for its mediatorial work, not by the mind and will inhabiting it, but by an inconceivable process of evolution involving all the earlier forms of cosmic action, when at last the fleshly tenement is fully ready, the mind enters and assumes control. The body, being thus, though prepared and fitted for the dominion of mind, as the instrument of all its activity, nevertheless not yet wonted and adjusted to rational control; evidently, the part that rational will has to play in cosmic evolution will depend wholly upon the thoroughness and efficiency of the mastery it achieves over the body it inhabits. Or, in other words, since we instinctively identify the body with the mind to whose activities it is practically indispensable, the success of rational will in the world *will depend on the thoroughness of our self-control.*

And by self-control we mean self-mastery in an indefinitely large and expanding sense —a mastery of the *physical* principles, represented by gravitation, that enter into the structure and regimen of a powerful and delicately trained physique; a mastery of the *chemical* constitution and action of the organs

and tissues, the chemical conditions of functional changes, of waste and repair, the value of foods, and all that goes to the making of a sound body, clean and alert; and lastly, a mastery of *biological* laws—the laws of growth, of inheritance, of the interaction of organism and environment—even to the highest developments of organic and functional life, namely, the phenomenal conditions of thought, feeling, and volition—to the end that a man may not be the slave but the master of the lower orders of evolutionary phenomena that enter into his humanity; and that he may direct and mould them into harmony with the law of his own supreme nature—his sovereign rational will. History furnishes many notable instances of self-mastery. The wisely ordered and persistent will of many a man less conspicuous than William of Orange, has conquered adversity of circumstances and infirmity of the flesh and achieved greatness. And it is a true philosophy, namely, the philosophy of evolution, that makes the destiny of every man depend primarily, not on biological law, but on Reason and on Will—on his own rational self-determination.

2. Rational will, as the last and highest form of cosmic control, *guarantees to man the control over his physical environment.* It guarantees it, that is to say, within the limits of reason as to the choice of man's habitat, and under conditions imposed by the gradual development of man's rational self-consciousness and self-determination; as well as on the understanding that the subordinate orders of control and their products, not extinguished but employed, do still, by virtue of their residuary authority, permanently give their character to the subordinated environment, and thus negatively limit and condition the dominant will.

So, while no man can reasonably choose the ice-bound cliffs of Greenland, or the fiery sands of Sahara as his home, in the thought of subduing his environment; while man in the lowest stage of savagery would starve on almost any prairie of the temperate zone away from a natural nut and fruit supply; and while no amount of civilization can ever identify the conditions and character of the progress in Switzerland with those of the Mississippi valley, or those of the tropics with those of the temperate zone; it is yet true that the

genius of man is immeasurably superior to the average conditions of climate, topography, and natural resources, and may supplement or even reverse the most marked deficiencies of convenience or utility. It is only the undeveloped man who is the creature of circumstances. The history of civilization is the history of man's mastery of circumstances.

Beginning with living only where he can find food ready to his hand, he learns to hunt and fish, to sow and reap, and to domesticate useful animals; to fashion implements of agriculture and weapons for war; to build houses and boats—all the while enlarging the territory within which he can safely and comfortably live. He learns to work in stone, in bronze, in iron, in steel. He learns to think, to study himself and nature, to classify his knowledge, to formulate sciences, and to coordinate them into a philosophic unity—he is getting at the mysteries of nature; he is pressing them into his service. Not so very long ago, mountains and rivers were the bulwarks of nations; now they have been annihilated by bridges and tunnels; and the seas, that were of yore the dwelling-place of darkness

and of dragons, have become the highways of a world's commerce and civilization. Deserts have been transformed into gardens. The remotest corners of the earth lay their treasures at the door of every man. And in a thousand ways man's dependence upon nature has been changed, by the evolution of man's intelligent self-determination, into nature's subserviency to man.

Thus, as man assumes his prerogative over nature and imposes his will upon it, *nature assumes a new character*, as the integrated masses of atoms in the primordial cosmos took on a new character under the touch of chemical force. She is no longer the wild nature of our forefathers; but nature transformed, subdued, ordered, harnessed for service. And in her great cities and continental railways, and in all the mighty machinery of civilization, she speaks more distinctly of a Rational Order above and of a Destiny before us, than in her untamed moods she ever spoke to any but the poet's ear. And that, because the present order is an advance upon the old, as bearing the imprint of a later and higher species of cosmic force, namely, the rational will of man.

CHAPTER VI

Relations of Rational Will to Objective Control

WE have seen that the unity of evolution argues the existence of a Cause adequate to produce it, and actually producing it—a cause competent to originate the phenomena of gravitation, chemical affinity, life, and rational will, and to carry on the harmonious coöperation of these forces in the unity of a coherently progressive world movement. It is now important to note some of the relations of rational will, the dominant form of cosmic control, to this hypothetical but philosophically necessary (Kant, Spencer) supra-cosmic control.

1. Rational will is *one with the earlier forms of cosmic control in some of its relations to the causal Force.* We must believe that, as the same cause produced man that produced the universe, so the entire course of human life on earth is virtually planned—mapped out before-

hand, whether consciously so or not;—that the plan thus marked out is what we recognize *a parte post* as the order of evolution; and that this orderly progress has taken place in the past, and *will take place in the future*, in exact accordance with the law of evolution, and without any possibility of failure—precisely as the physical, chemical, and vital stages of evolution have taken place in accordance with that law. We cannot think that the Force which has carried on the cosmic movement for untold millions of years on what we now see to have been a wonderful order, or plan, has suddenly stopped work in our little day; or that the plan has run out, and that the future portions of the work will be at random, or out of harmony with the past. Nor can we believe it is in our power to block or to divert the wheels of that progress. Sooner might we hope to block the planets in their courses, since the movements of the planets are but a subordinate incident in the operation of the Power behind the cosmic process. We must suppose the Great Cause to be at least as present and as active in the later and higher stages of evolution as in the preparatory

stages—as active in the life and work of man as in the vibrations of atoms and molecules.

2. Rational will *differs from the earlier forms of cosmic control*, in that the great Cause determines its activity by moral rather than by physical force. That is to say, the mind and will of man are not moved like the stars by mere power, be it physical, chemical, or vital; but by the rational apprehension of facts—phenomena and the relations of phenomena. In all stages of evolution the object controlled is approximately self-moved—the control operates from within; but in the earlier stages the control is appropriate to its object, matter; while in the last stage it is appropriate to the object, mind. And the peculiarity of the control of mind is, that it is determined to action by its own *self-conscious knowledge.*

3. *Man's normal conduct*, accordingly, *is the self-determined translation into action of the plan of the Power above us*—the realization of that plan by becoming physically, intellectually, and morally, what it ordains—by achieving in action what it has prescribed for our attainment. The prescribed order of the universe, together with the Power that prescribes

it, is our environment; and the prescribed order of human existence is the pattern of our self-realization—the basis of that harmony with environment which constitutes our true life. It behooves us, therefore, to study the cosmic process in all its aspects, but with special reference to the light it throws upon the nature and destiny of man, that we may wisely direct our striving in accordance with the plan prescribed for us therein by the unseen Author of our being.

4. Since, in accordance with human nature, man's conformity with the cosmic plan is ideally self-determined, it must not only always be limited by the knowledge we possess, but it is also *exposed to the possibility of actual defection.* Man, distinctly aware of the order of nature and of his obligation to observe it, may yet deliberately refuse to observe it. And, while it is exceedingly difficult to understand how an evolutionary being—a being whose every power vibrates with the evolutionary impulse—can deliberately violate his nature by committing an anti-evolutionary act; yet we know that, as a matter of fact, hosts of men, who *know* the dictates of their rational

and ethical nature, are yet living grossly degraded and animalized lives, the votaries of appetite and lust. They have chosen, and they are pursuing and cultivating, regardless of the calls and warnings of their evolutionary nature, a bestial existence.

Such persons are out of harmony with the creative plan of the universe—out of harmony with evolution—out of harmony with environment. And they are continually becoming more so. Nay, they are at war with themselves and with environment—at war with the essential conditions of existence. Such an abnormal attitude of the rational nature and the consequent moral deformity of all that springs out of it, whether action, word, thought, or feeling, is what intelligent people mean—or ought to mean—when they speak of *sin*, as sin is differenced from imperfection ; the former signifying an outraged nature, the latter a normal nature whose powers are not yet fully developed. And those men who deny that there is such a thing as sin, or as its correlate human freedom—a power of choosing adversely to the normal order of life—have, I surmise, allowed their excursions into

speculative philosophy to lead them too far astray from the *facts* of a scientific doctrine of evolution.

5. The categorical imperative of duty—*conscience*—is a law, seated in and dominant over our rational nature, requiring us to conform in all respects to the order of moral evolution, not merely as we know it, but as we ought to know it—as we, enlightened in part by the study of evolution, must suppose that we shall know it when we have learned to read more perfectly the higher lessons of cosmic order—the lessons that adequately represent the creative plan of human progress. This law is thus a voice of sovereign Rightness within and over us; and every right-minded person must not only obey its every dictate, but must cherish and cultivate it as his safest revelation of the Ideal Right—our safest clue on the upward path to the goal of the evolutionary life.

SOCIAL CONTROL

CHAPTER VII

Society as an Evolution

HAVING noticed the nature of control in general, as deduced from a view of the cosmic process in its entirety; and having applied the principles thus elicited to the evolution of the individual human being; we proceed to apply them as best we may to social aggregates. In doing this, we shall proceed as before, discussing, first, society as an evolution; and, secondly, control in society.

Whatever other characteristics may be predicated of it, society is obviously an aggregate of individual human beings. But the character of an aggregate is always of necessity determined wholly, where it is free from foreign disturbance, by two factors:—first, by the nature of the units composing it; and, secondly, by the nature of the bonds uniting these units. The nature of a pile of bricks, regarded merely as a fact and without reference to its origin, is determined by the nature

—size, shape, consistency, etc.—of the individual bricks, and by the force of gravitation that holds them in place. And human society is characterized in like manner, by the nature of individual human beings, and by the nature of the social force that unites them.

1. *The individual human being in his maturity is the normal social unit, or socius.* That is to say, the individual is the unit in a society whose members have attained to the rational stage of evolution.

It is easily to be seen that, in primitive conditions, where men, like sheep, have little knowledge and little capacity for individual initiative, and where they instinctively follow some one who by birth or by ability is a natural leader,—the *tribe* or the *clan* is the real social unit.

And, in later and higher conditions, where titles, property, social standing, and participation in public affairs, are determined largely by a law of descent from a particular ancestor,—the character and abilities of the individual being a subordinate consideration,—it is plain that the *family* is rightly conceived of as the social unit.

But where the individuals composing society have developed beyond the point where some form of biological aggregation gives the prevailing character to their social relations, to the point where they are primarily governed in these relations by their own intelligent self-determined rational will; then the social unit is the *owner of the rational will* that, in conjunction with similar wills, constitutes society what it is and creates destiny for it.

The evolution of the normal socius has been concurrent, if not identical, with the evolution of democracy in civil government. So soon as reason became self-conscious in man, and master of itself, it refused to acknowledge any man as master, in any capacity in life, save by its own election. When that point was reached, and not till then, Manhood became conscious of itself. And when, further, self-conscious Manhood asserted and vindicated its prerogative *for Man*, irrespective of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude," then, for the first time in human history, had dawned the morning of Humanity's majority—the race, like the individual, was coming of age.

And then, for the first time in human history, a *rational* sociology became possible. For, until then, society itself had been in leading strings. Not yet having attained to the prerogative of rational self-determination, it was not prepared to understand, much less to formulate, the principles of a social order and a social progress based upon rational self-determination. Science is an interpretation of fact, not a formulation of prophetic speculation; and thus society's actual attainment of her maturity must antedate the scientific formulation of a doctrine of society's maturity.

2. The *bond* uniting mature individuals into society is *rational will*, supplemented by the organic relations arising between human beings by virtue of the fact that they, the individual units composing society, are themselves living organisms.

It is a law of nature that like atoms or units of any sort tend to aggregation, or integration—the atoms gathering themselves together and uniting into a composite mass, of which they then severally constitute the parts. Thus, precisely as the primordial atoms of matter integrated to form the worlds;

as the chemically compounded molecules integrated to form the various mineral constituents of inorganic nature; and as the exceedingly complex and mobile molecules of protoplasm integrated to form living plants and animals; just so it is always true that, wherever men exist, they gravitate inevitably into communities.

With *savages* of some primitive sorts this gravitation into communities is about all there is of the social bond. The individuals being absolutely simple in their tastes, wants, and activities; and each one performing all the functions requisite to their primitive order of existence — aggregation means for them merely a crude companionship and the increased security in offense and defense arising from the *weight* of the social mass. Yet even among the crudest savages the sex relation determines certain differences of social duty, and contains thus the germ and prophecy of a social organism.

When savages rise to *barbarism*, along with an increase in the number of the tastes, needs, and activities of individuals, there is observable a tendency to readjustment whereby the

differences of men are made more largely available for social ends. The differences of social duty, based on the sex relation, are much more numerous than in savagery, and every species of social grouping exhibits a tendency to redistribution into classes, notably into the regulating and the regulated, on the basis of differences of birth or of talent.

Civilization, multiplying the needs, tastes, and activities of individuals, superadds to the above a complication of organic and functional relations based on the social integration of multitudinous particular interests of individual human beings, the union of all into one living social organism being the natural consequence of the vital union of all these interests in one living personality—the unit of society. This social organism lives and grows from age to age, spontaneously adjusting itself to the total life of the people in accordance with the felt, but not understood, laws of human nature.

But as man, still enlarging his personality, rises into the *maturity* of rational self-consciousness and self-determination, a new era is ushered in, which may be called the era of

enlightenment—an era in which the instructed rational wills of men, integrated by the intelligent and voluntary coöperation of individuals into a social rational will, becomes the primary social bond, subordinating every other.

(1) *Rational will*, regarded as a social bond, *presupposes mutual acquaintance of socii.*

If each man were totally ignorant of the existence of other men, there would be no society, even though there were thousands of men in the immediate vicinity. If each knew that other men exist, but only by indirection, as by observing their footprints in the soil; sympathetic feelings might be stirred, but there could not be any true society. Society is the state of being *socii*, or companions, the state of associating together; and this implies a certain degree of mutual acquaintance.

But a strictly *personal* association and acquaintance is necessarily restricted within comparatively narrow bounds; and the society that should rest upon such a basis must be a very small one. Personal acquaintance, however, is not necessary. A knowledge that *particular* persons exist is not necessary. An

assurance that certain aggregates of men exist, at any distance from us, who have a certain character, as, for example, a certain language, certain institutions, certain political ideas—an assurance constantly renewed by freedom of communication and intercourse, and which any one may make doubly sure by personal visitation — is a sufficient acquaintance. But something like this is essential.

And this, in a country as great as ours, implies the existence of a vast system of postal, telegraph, railway, and steamboat facilities, and a degree of education and culture in the people adequate to a right appreciation and efficient use of these facilities. And all this implies of course an advanced civilization. But the civilization and its appliances *unused*, or not used in the way of promoting mutual acquaintance among the remote parts of the country will constitute no adequate social bond. Many persons now living will remember the apprehensions of a centrifugal tendency in the population of the Pacific Slope, that entered so largely into the inspiration of the first trans-continental railway.

(2) *Fellowship* is essential as an element of the rational social bond.

If mutual acquaintance reveals only differences and antagonisms, there will be no society, but more likely an explosion. But if it shows that the individuals agree in certain important particulars, as, for example, that they have the same trade, they immediately experience a feeling of mutual attraction and of liking for one another. They want to shake hands, get better acquainted, and talk matters over to see what they can do to make their acquaintance pleasant and profitable. In other words, finding that they are *fellows*, or comrades, in certain respects, they spontaneously experience the feeling natural to that relation; namely, the *feeling of fellowship;* or, as Giddings call it, the "consciousness of kind."

Fellowship arises on the basis of a *perceived identity or community of interests.* Anything of sufficient definiteness and importance to be an object of desire may constitute an interest; and whenever a number of individuals discover that they are each and all interested in one and the same general object, they are im-

mediately, and by virtue of a law of human nature, in fellowship, on the basis and to the extent of that interest; and that however important or however trivial the interest may be—whether it be an interest in caroms or in the moral renovation of the world—and whether it be permanent or transient.

(3) *Coöperation* is essential as an element in the normal social bond.

That is to say, coöperation is essential, not in general, but with special reference to the interest that constitutes the basis of the fellowship, and in promotion of that interest. Fellowship expresses itself in a coöperation determined by the subject-matter involved. Artists coöperate in furtherance of art; scientists in promotion of science—each in his own special domain.

But coöperation, to be serviceable and efficient, must be orderly; and, if it is to be of any permanence it must be conducted according to established *rules;* and these, to be available at all times, must be written or printed, in the form of a *constitution* and *by-laws.* These must be kept safely where consultation of them is easy; and there must be

persons who are responsible for the preservation and care of them and to produce them when required. There will be *meetings* of those interested, which, to be generally known and calculated upon by all, will naturally occur at a particular place and at stated times; and there will be persons to prepare for the meetings and to have charge of them and of the business involved—*officers* of various sorts.

In other words, *coöperation is organization.* And the organization of a body of people, in fellowship on the basis of a particular interest, is *a society.* And the aggregate of the societies, actual or potential, representing all human interests, related as they are in an organic interdependence corresponding to the unity of the organic and functional life of the individual, constitutes *Society.*

Society, normal and mature, consists, thus, when fully realized, of the integrated rational wills of the mature population, as those wills are exercised relative to the sum total of social interests.

That this is the true conception, any believer in social democracy must be convinced, who notes the working of the democratic idea

in American politics, imperfect as it undoubtedly is. For here legislators undoubtedly have their eyes fixed, for the deciding impulse to action, not upon any fine-spun theories of social order and progress, and not primarily upon their own views of public utility, though they are expected to have and to use such views; but primarily upon the *expressed will of their constituents.* And this is not a blemish upon the democratic system; it *is* the system. Legislators are understood to be the servants of the people. And when their constituents have a will, clear, intelligent, and commanding, and express it with an unequivocal emphasis, legislatures understand that they must obey it. And they will obey it, irrespective of their own personal opinions and inclinations; and they will vote a Spanish war, or relief to Cuba, or any other measure that they clearly see is required, however disagreeable or financially unprofitable to themselves, because they know that the People have their eyes upon them, and that they have a day of judgment in store for their disobedient servants.

The only place where legislators are sup-

posed to have and to insist upon a mind of their own, is in the region of the residuary element of individual control;—in the manifold routine of legislation, concerning which constituents are not qualified or interested to dictate; and in matters of personal duty, with reference to which the lawmaker owes it to himself to act independently.

All that is needed to make this conception a thoroughly working reality, is a very little further development of the average American citizen in the intelligent grasp of public interests, in independent self-determination toward evolutionary ends, and in facility in the invention and manipulation of machinery for the expression of public opinion.

Meanwhile, it is true, that American institutions are what they are to-day, not so much because they are an organic outgrowth from the past—not so much because they have been imposed upon us by the blind surgings of social evolution in other days—but primarily because they represent approximately the *present aggregate intelligence and the present aggregate will* of the American people. They were adopted in the first place as the deliber-

ate choice of such an aggregate rational will. Once since then the progress of events has given the people an opportunity to express their opinion of their institutions in their blood; and the opinion was—approval, with the removal of a blot. And we know that the present sentiment is approval; and that when amendments are generally desired they will be made, without fail, and made because these institutions *are*, primarily, nothing more or less than an expression of *will* by a community of intelligent self-determined men, coöperating on the basis of their common interests and in promotion of those interests.

The aggregate rational will, whose nature and operation are thus illustrated in the political life of America, while constituting the primary bond that unites mature individuals into society, not only admits but requires the *subordinate and supplementary coöperation of other principles.* The sum total of activities that would be necessary if all the combinations and relations of society were to be created ever anew and ordered continually by an active exercise of the reason and the will, would be overpowering and impossible

of accomplishment. But the combinations and relations of society are not thus continually created and ordered anew. They constitute the social *organism*, which, for the most part, has been built up by the immemorial gradual operation of the vital and rational instincts in humanity, and has been transmitted to us entire as our biological inheritance from the past. The same is largely true of the functional life and activities of society. And when rational will comes to the front, it does not undertake the new creation of society, but merely—by the normal methods of a new and higher order of control—subjects and employs the existing status. Thus the greater share of social activities and relations are from the first, or speedily become by usage, like the major part of individual relations and activities, automatic; and that, not alone in the transition from the biological to the rational stage of social evolution, but no less in the rational stage itself.

Of society as an evolution *in history* enough has been said under the head of the evolution of individual autonomy. It is evident that

the coöperation of autonomous individuals is autonomous, and that the historic progress of society toward autonomy is identical with the historic progress of individuals in the same direction.

While in speaking of society we ordinarily have no very definite idea in mind; and while, when attempting to attain definiteness, we vaguely limit our conception to our own nation; we yet always assert for all others the same right to a self-determining autonomy that we maintain for ourselves. We hold this to be a *human* right. Our ultimate conception of society supposes, accordingly, the active coöperation of *all men* in the maintenance and promotion of all human interests; and it looks forward to a time, in the evolutionary movement of society, when national boundaries, interests, and sympathies, will be seen to have but a subsidiary function as stepping-stones to the unification and complete civilization of Humanity. And no individual human being has achieved for himself a fully rounded ideal of personal character—has become the *ideal socius*—till he has molded all his thoughts and attuned all his

sympathies to the doctrine of the "universal brotherhood of man."

3. *Mature societies are classified* according to the degree of evolution indicated by the predominant character of the interests constituting their basal principle. A society based on material interests—security to home and business, protection against foreign foes, the maintenance of industrial and economic rights—is properly styled *materialistic.* One inspired by devotion to science, art, philosophy, education, literature, is *intellectual.* And one characterized by a paramount devotion to ethical interests is *moral.*

It has perhaps been inevitable that a great majority of democratic societies in the past, and among them nearly or quite all national democracies, have been *materialistic.* Comparatively few men have reached the intellectual stage. And, although the number of such is on the increase, they hardly constitute a working majority in any community. The vast majority of men are still chiefly involved in money-making and in supplying the material needs of life. We suppose American democracy to be in the van of civilization. But one

of the commonest reproaches against us has been that we are grossly materialistic. Our defense has been, not denial, but confession and avoidance—we have been too busy subduing a continent and making it habitable, to cultivate our minds as we ought. This does not mean that we have altogether neglected our spiritual interests, intellectual or moral. It means that it is true of us *as a people*, that the interests commanding the largest place in our thoughts and feelings—the most spontaneous and natural impulses of evolutionary aggressiveness—have been material.

There are, however, signs of progress:—signs that public opinion is rising to a conception of the *primacy of the intellect* over material interests. The universality of the critical spirit, which lays the axe of scientific inquiry at the root of every time-honored opinion, and summons every venerable institution to show cause why it should not be remanded to the rubbish-heap:—is a sure token that the magical spell of our organic intellectual relation to the past is broken, and that we are beginning to think for ourselves—nay, are beginning to feel the responsibility of intellec-

tual independence. It means that our bondage to retrogressive ideals is past, and that henceforth the day-star that is to rule our destiny will arise from the future—out of that transcendent True and Beautiful and Good, which constitutes the goal of the world-process. The rise of the non-partisan thinker and voter in politics, indicates that the time is at hand when we shall not meekly line up at the polls .to voice the will of party bosses. Education is brushing away the cobwebs of prejudice and prescription and custom, and bringing each man face to face with truth, and is showing us that the individual is not altogether the creature, but is in the very highest sense the creator, of society; that he is not the slave but the master of his environment, and that complete manhood implies rational self-determination in all relations, and the mute following of precedent, like "dumb driven cattle," in none at all. And education is fast rising to be the paramount interest in American society. People of all ages and both sexes take pride in being students. Public opinion inculcates the responsibility of individuals for the general weal; and men of

shrewd foresight and public spirit have expressed their judgment as to the nature of the social interests that rule the future, by the voluntary endowment of vast educational institutions—contributing above $100,000,000 to that purpose in a single year (1901).

The *moral stage* of social evolution is the stage in which society as a whole is characterized by a paramount self-determination toward the attainment of evolutionary ideals of thought, feeling, and action. The moral evolution of society can hardly rise above the blind spontaneous movement of the organic or vital stage, save upon the basis of a *rational* apprehension of fact. We can conceive that all men might be induced, by the transcendent excellence of moral ideals and by authority or influence of some sort, to devote themselves to the resolute pursuit of the true, the beautiful, and the good; but we know that they will not. And it is not easy to say that they ought. Rational self-determination, while true to itself in following any guide that gives adequate assurance of competency, is yet most true to itself when, penetrating into the very arcana of truth, it formulates the rules and principles

of conduct it should observe, by an exercise of its own powers and on the basis of science. This is the prerogative of reason; the supreme prerogative of man. And we of this generation are happy, above all generations of men that have gone before us, in having in the doctrine of evolution a scientific theory competent to the formulation of a truly rational system of ethics. It is, for us, the earnest of a moral progress in the near future such as the world has never yet witnessed.

Meanwhile, in response to the moral education of the home, the school, the church, and of voluntary associations for specific moral ends, a large and active element of the population is gathering its energies for the conquest of the world to obedience to the sovereign law of right. With philosophy and science as allies—and in the doctrine of evolution they certainly are becoming allies, in a sense in which they have generally been regarded as hostile—this beneficent purpose will be indefinitely furthered, and the day when society shall attain to a predominantly ethical character may be brought within the range of practical possibilities.

CHAPTER VIII

Nature of Social Control

THE voluntary coöperation of self-determined socii—the integration of the rational wills of the social units, constituting the will of society—is the constituent, or controlling, force, not only in social statics, where we have discussed it as the social bond; but especially also in the dynamics, or movement, of society. It determines not only a higher and more evolved *order*, but also a more advanced species of *progress*, than that of the individual. I shall notice briefly the nature of control in society; the methods by which it is to be maintained; and some of the more important of its relations to individual control. This chapter relates to the *nature* of social control.

Since an aggregate of mature human beings is an aggregate of independent rational wills, and since the union of these wills into a social will must be conceived of as voluntary or self-

determined, and self-determined with an intelligent view to the promotion of common interests; the question at once arises, how these several wills coöperate. On what principles and by what methods do they act together as one? The coöperation will be formal and informal.

1. Self-determined individuals, who are moved in matters concerning the general welfare of society by a personal interest based upon an instructed intelligence, will always act in those matters more or less independently, or in an *informal coöperation* with their neighbors. Indeed, the major part, and the most fundamental and most important part, of our coöperation in society is of this sort. In home, shop, office, upon the street, wherever men pass a word of greeting with each other, the question springs:—"What do you think of the Philippine problem?" . . . . "of the Isthmian canal?" . . . . "of St. Thomas?" etc. So, through all the multiform channels of informal social intercourse, the opinions of individuals are exchanged, discussed, clarified, rectified, and an intelligent *public opinion* is formed.

Supplementary to the purely informal method of cultivating public opinion, but determined by the spontaneous and voluntary action of the individuals interested, is a great variety of meetings, debates, speeches, etc., for the interchange of opinions and for giving united expression to their convictions or desires relative to matters of common interest.

2. There will naturally be also a *formal cooperation.* And this, the equal sovereignty of the individual wills being duly recognized, has in general been determined upon by reason and experience according to the following method, which is equally applicable to societies of all descriptions, public or private; political, religious, industrial, social, etc.; and, when appropriately supplemented by an adequate system of representation, of all sizes:— The qualifications of persons entitled to participate in the coöperative activities being definitely established and enunciated by a majority vote or by traditional methods, a list of those answering to these qualifications is made out; a constitution and by-laws are adopted in a duly-appointed meeting, by a majority vote, or by such preponderance of

votes as some previous majority vote has decided upon for the purpose; and thereafter every practical question is decided in meetings held and by votes taken according to the constitution and by-laws.

This method of integrating the rational wills of individuals, and thus constituting a social rational will, is so simple and so obvious —we may say, so natural—that to a native-born American, habituated to it from childhood, the wonder is, that any one in his senses could fail to think of it or lack the skill to make an effective use of it, even without previous knowledge or experience. But, as a matter of fact, this obvious and simple device has been the result of milleniums of evolutionary development—the one survival out of a vast multitude of experiments at coöperation. And, indeed, it is not so simple as it seems. It is an implement appropriate, not to a primitive civilization, but to the maturity of mankind. It presupposes a high ethical development in the people employing it—a profound appreciation, among other things, of the importance of the many to the one, of the obligations of the one to the many, and of the

superiority of the social state to the state of individual isolation. It presupposes a social spirit—a regard for the rights and welfare of others; sympathy; unselfishness; a sincere desire to guard and to promote the interests of others as well as one's own interests. It presupposes a deep-seated sense of justice and love of fair play; a large faith in humanity and in the ultimate triumph of all that is reasonable and right and progressive in the convictions and the conduct of men; and a willingness to postpone one's own wishes and interests to the expressed will of a majority, trusting, for the correction of any temporary hardship, to the good sense and justice of the multitude. It was a lack of this ethical development among the Greek peoples, more than all other causes combined,—a lack of unselfish, altruistic righteousness in the rank and file of the population,—that paralyzed and finally subverted the liberties and the civilization of ancient Greece.

This mode of integrating the wills of individuals is not incompatible with their freedom. In purely voluntary societies, or those in which membership is optional, the truth of

this statement is obvious. Members who feel themselves aggrieved by any action of the society, can at any time step out without any necessary violation of evolutionary, or moral, law.

But when the interests underlying the cooperation have an imperative claim upon us, because of their ethical nature, or because of their universality and logical necessity; then the voluntariness of the coöperation is, at first sight, not so obvious; as, for example, in the maintenance of civil government. The citizen is bound to obey the laws of the land or lose his liberty, in some cases even his life. Is he, therefore, not free?

If the laws are bad and thoroughly enforced, no, the individual citizen is not free. An uncompromising advocate of human freedom and equality was not free to speak his mind in some portions of our land in slavery days.

But if the laws are good; if they are truly evolutionary; then the citizen who has a good character, an evolutionary disposition, is truly free under their benign sway. He does not feel their enactments as a burden. They are not galling as a restraint. He does not feel

them as directed to himself. They are not. On the contrary, by implication at least, they are an expression of *his own sovereign will*—self-determined constituent of the social will—and they are directed to the guidance of the ignorant and the restraint of the vicious. It is only the lawless whose freedom is impaired by good laws. For the true freeman is, not the man who refuses all dominion of law, for such a man is lawless; but he is the man whose every thought and feeling and impulse, and every voluntary self-determination, is itself an expression of righteous law, whether the law be human or cosmic in its origin.

Obviously, however, the imperfection both of individuals and of society forbids us to expect more than a proximate approach to such ideal harmony between the individual rational will and the rational will of society. There will be defectively instructed individuals, and there will be faultily evolved expressions of public opinion; and in many ways the freedom of the individual may be impaired by the lack of harmony between him and society; and injustice and hardship will result. The remedy for such ills is to be found in a further evolu-

tion, both of the individual and of society;—in the cultivation of that harmony with the world-order which constitutes the goal of supreme aspiration and effort for all men, both as individuals and collectively.

CHAPTER IX

Maintenance of Social Control

A TRUE social control must provide, not only for a method of coöperation of free rational wills, but also for the *cultivation and maintenance of evolutionary majorities* on all social questions—the ideal being, of course, a total population united in the evolutionary movement.

This is to be achieved only by cultivating in the individual, first, the largest apprehension of evolutionary facts and their relations, these being adapted to a development of the broadest and most intelligent individual and social self-consciousness; secondly, an independent and thoroughly rational power and habit of self-determination; and, thirdly, the evolutionary trend.

All these ends will naturally be subserved by a comprehensive *system of education*, which shall include, besides the communication of facts in scientific order, also all that is implied

in the terms discipline, training, culture. It is a remarkable fact, and a fact in which the world's progress is wrapped up, that all the acquisitions of past ages, if rightly utilized, may be made available as the beginning and foundation of the achievements of each rising generation. And experience has taught us that this utilization of the accumulated stores of the past is to be compassed by a universal educational system.

1. The educational system that should adequately represent society's struggle for self-realization and create an efficient public opinion, will naturally include a system of *public schools*, graded from kindergarten to university, and embracing, besides the regular courses, an indefinite variety of lectureships, correspondence courses, and other auxiliary agencies calculated to make the educational resources of the public serviceable so far as possible for all classes and all conditions of men—all these being maintained from the public treasury and free for all. Such a system should aim to ground the entire population in the rudiments of an education; and to make available, to all who are competent to

enter and take possession, every higher department of human knowledge.

2. *Private schools*, also, of all grades and species, may appropriately constitute a supplementary factor in such a system, representing individual, local, or class conceptions of needs that society as such can not, or does not, meet. Such needs have been felt, in decades not long past, and even to this day, relative to certain phases of scientific and technical instruction; and they are liable to be felt for a long time to come in the higher fields of ethical education.

3. Parallel with the school system, to which it furnishes its material, and constituting by itself a vast educational equipment, is the world's *literature*. Representing the profoundest results of human thought in all departments, wrought into permanent form by the painstaking labors of the greatest minds, it forms the trunk and main branches of the tree of human knowledge; while a vastly diversified periodical literature represents the growing portions, in its function of education by agitation, and in its resulting deposition of a permanent stratum of truth.

4. Public opinion is cultivated also by an indefinite variety of agencies specially designed and adapted for the *inculcation of ideals.* Fiction in literature, including the novel, poetry, the drama; art, as oratory, music, painting, sculpture; ceremonial, attending the inauguration or promotion of world interests, etc.; and the exploitation of badges, symbols, standards, etc., calculated to touch the hearts and fire the zeal of men for the ideals that most intimately concern them:— all these various agencies, singly and in combination, exercise an untold influence upon the thoughts, feelings, and actions of men— an influence that often amounts to a spell more potent than reason can attain to or account for, as in the case of some of the national watchwords or emblems. Perhaps the truly evolutionary training of public opinion, in this day of world powers and world movements, could be promoted by nothing more effectually than by the production of a popular song breathing world ideals, as "America," and other national hymns, voice the national spirit in their respective countries. The happy author of such a hymn

might have to wait for recognition, for mankind are not yet fully developed into tune with world interests, as with those of "freedom and native land;" but he would be one of the world's greatest benefactors.

CHAPTER X

Relations of Social Control to Individual Control

While mature, or democratic, societies are subject to classification as materialistic, intellectual, and moral; and while, in society as a whole, these characters are historically successive in this order; it is also true, because rational will is the supreme control, both in society and in the individual, that the relations of social control to individual control are primarily and chiefly the relations of the social rational will to the rational wills of the several individuals who constitute society. These are very important, and suggest, if I mistake not, the solution of some of the moot problems of ethics and sociology.

1. Social control is a later evolution, and therefore a *higher form of control*, than the rational will of the individual, which it presupposes as an element.

2. Social control enters to *assert a sovereign authority over all previous forms of control,* including the individual rational will. It comes to give a new character to the cosmic process:—henceforth it is social, and not merely rational and human. Henceforth mankind are to find their destiny, not in solitary isolation, and not in the blind operation of the vital and organic processes of a higher form of animal gregariousness, but in a self-determined obedience to the rational and ethical law of human brotherhood, as the law finds concrete expression in the dicta of the social rational will.

The will of the many should dominate the will of the one, or of the few; the will of a majority should dominate the will of a minority. This is a corollary of the equality of individuals as to their natural rights, and is not to be conceived of as an infringement of the rights of the individual. Although, historically, social coöperation is a part of our biological inheritance; and although we might naturally expect the subordination of the individual to cease when man rises to intelligent self-determination, and the social rela-

tions are rescued from bondage to tradition and placed on a rational democratic basis by the voluntary action of freemen; yet, as a matter of fact, we know that such is not, and can not be, the case. The understanding necessarily underlying coöperative action, and postulated by those who take it, is, that the evolutionary Plan of things identifies the true freedom of the individual, not with the absence of all social restraint, but with the subordination of the individual to the duly-expressed rational will of society.

3. The *field* in which social control is dominant is *narrower than that under individual control.*

Society has to do with only a portion of the interests of the individual—the portion he has in common with other men. As the national government deals with national interests, and state governments deal with state interests, county governments with county interests, etc., so social control relates only to social interests, while the individual retains control of that which is to him primarily an individual interest. The individual no more yields all his personal interests to the control of society,

than gravitation yields the architectonic control of the cosmos to chemical affinity—the latter being a later and higher form of control, but not necessarily on that account a universal control.

4. There is thus a *residuary sphere of control remaining in the individual*—that which primarily concerns him, and which does not, *primarily*, concern society.

For, that the most private affairs of the individual indirectly affect society, and therefore concern it, is obvious. But there are some things that no man includes in his voluntary coöperation with his fellows; some things that no man has a right to subject to social domination; some things which it is his duty as a man to determine for himself.

(1) Under the head of that which *by general consent* primarily concerns the indvidual, we may discover the major part of the field of his residuary control. The control of his personal physical and mental regimen, the choice of his business, his studies, recreations, place of abode; his marriage or celibacy; his scientific, religious, ethical, or political opinions—subject only to the condition of non-interfer-

ence with the rights of others—rests with each man for himself. And no one would wish to abridge his authority, nor would he wish others to share it with him. Nevertheless in all these matters society has a certain informal control, effected by public opinion, and expressed variously, as by social usage and custom, which largely modifies, and every sane man wishes it to modify, the hue and texture of our private affairs.

(2) A more vital, if narrower, section of the residuary sphere of individual control, is that which is determined by *the categorical imperative of duty*—the conscience, or the evolutionary demand of individual human nature.

The general rule undoubtedly is that social interests prevail over individual interests. The material interests of the individual, for example, should be subordinated to the material welfare of society; and the rational will of society must be accounted superior to the rational will of the individual in deciding what, relative to material interests, belongs to the welfare of society.

But we must not lose our point of view:—In so far as reference is had to the self-conscious

self-determinations of individuals or of society; that is, to the control of rational will; *man is not the creature, but the creator, of society;* and we may set it down as a fundamental principle that we have no right to confer on others—on society—the power to destroy, or to impair in any way, our manhood. To assert that we have such a right, is to promulgate a doctrine of the legitimacy of individual and social suicide. Not merely for self, but also for the sake of society, which *is* what the aggregate of individual characters makes it, we should guard and cultivate with sedulous care our own moral integrity and dignity. Nay, we should press toward the ideal of evolutionary living with unflagging zeal, for the two equally worthy and equally imperative ends—that we may realize ourselves and that we may realize society—that we may realize society in and through our self-realization. Or,—for the conception is equally true, though not equally representative of the order of succession in the evolutionary process,—that we may realize self in realizing society.

5. We naturally anticipate an *acceleration of movement* in advancing from individual

control to social control—a hastening of the rate at which the results of the world-process accumulate—answering to what we have discovered in the earlier stages of cosmic history.

But here we are doomed to disappointment. Whatever view we take—whether we consider the act itself of decision, or the working out of the results of the decision—the rational will of the individual operates far more promptly than the rational will of society. The truth of this assertion is obvious when we reflect that the rational will of society is an aggregation of individual rational wills, and that it is a law of psychology and of sociology, as well as of physics, that large bodies move slowly. One hundred independent wills are integrated into a single volition more slowly than any average one of the hundred acts by itself. And if we descend to the biological view, and regard the action of society as the result of laws governing the social organism and regulating the adjustment of internal relations to external relations, the retardation of the movement of society is yet more obvious.

The significance of this fact, that society moves more slowly than the individual, is :—

that the individual does not mark a stage of cosmic evolution, while society, as a whole, does. The acceleration of movement which we ought to expect, therefore, and which actually exists, is that by which the rational will of society outstrips the slow progress of vital or biological evolution. The individual never appears as marking a stage of cosmic progress; never appears alone, but always in society. If we suppose a first man rising to self-consciousness—the axial bud of the ascending animal tree—he was not complete without a mate. In these days of enlarged and vastly differentiated rational development, man is not complete without an indefinitely diversified and expanding social relationship. And it is not till this social relationship of the individual expands to the limits of humanity—not till the character and life of the individual become an expression of world sympathies, an embodiment of world interests—that the *cosmic* character of the human stage of evolution distinctly appears.

The end of evolution, and "the ultimate purpose or ideal end of human life in general,"

is in the perfection, not of the individual, but of society as a whole in which the individual is a part—and so far the "universalist" conception is true. It is also true, that the individual human being—the molecule of the social mass—in so far as man *is determined* by his connection with the "causal chain" of physical forces, is a *product* of the social environment no less than of the subrational evolution that culminates in man. But, at the same time, it is a mistake, and one grossly at variance with the general laws of cosmic progress, to suppose that the individual is related to society *merely* as a product. Whatever the relations of the individual and of society may be to nature and to the persistence of physical force, the individual, by virtue of the residuary element of control remaining in him, and to the extent of that element, is a *cause*, not an effect of society. The principal factor of this residuary control—the ethical rational will and the *self-determination* of man by it—is essential to the individual to constitute him the molecular unit of a normal society. Any view inconsistent with this is anti-evolutionary and unscientific, and

involves a reversal in the order of succession of some, at least, of the links in the chain of influences that determine the life of society and of individuals in society.

Moreover, the conception of the individual as a moral being solely, or chiefly, through his connection with society and by the awakening of social sympathies, is obviously a mistake; since, whatever the origin and evolutionary history of morality may have been, the rightness, or morality, of the individual *in his maturity* is determined by nothing else whatever but by his *self-determined conformity with the evolutionary plan of human life.* The man who subordinates his intellect and his conscience to his animal appetites and passions is an immoral man, though he never saw or heard of another human being, and irrespective of his relations to society. And our sympathies and social relations are themselves moral for no other reason but because they are in harmony with the scheme of evolution. And if we may suppose the very improbable case of a person whose conduct and sympathies are in strict accordance with the evolutionary plan, but, as it were, accidentally

so, through lack of temptation, or as a result of ancestral culture and training :—such a person, though very admirable and agreeable and helpful in all respects, is nevertheless not yet in the full sense of the term moral. He is innocent with the innocence of childhood ; and he will not become, properly speaking, moral, until, the maturity of his rational powers having been attained and the nature of the normal order of human life having been perceived, he voluntarily adopts that order as the law of his life and *determines for himself* to observe it, instead of observing it, as before, by reason of what others have determined for him.

The relations of social control to the sub-rational forms of cosmic control, have already been indicated, sufficiently for present purposes, under the head of Individual Control.

The same is true of the relations of social control to the objective control of the evolutionary Power.

THE SUBVERSION OF CONTROL

CHAPTER XI

Nature of the Counter-Evolution

THE Synthetic Philosophy of Herbert Spencer (First Principles, § 74) conceives of all movement of matter as determined by the action of two forces—an attraction and a repulsion—manifested in every atom and determining it somehow in its relations to other atoms. In integration the attractive forces overpower the repulsions and control the movement; while in dissolution the repulsions control. So every step in evolution has been made against *resistance.* And we do not need to appeal to philosophy in order to be convinced of this. Common experience would lead us to surmise that the inertia of primitive atoms must surely resist the integrating force of gravitation; and that the coherence of the resulting masses would resist the transformations of chemical affinity. And just so we are antecedently certain

that subrational nature, including the animal nature of man, will inevitably offer a decided resistance to the rational will in its assumption of supreme control, both in the individual human being and in society.

Such resistance, however, is not abnormal. It is the natural and necessary attitude of the undeveloped toward development; of the gross toward refinement. In society it is a necessary relation of ignorance toward culture; of ethical crudeness toward moral responsibility; of the unthinking element of the population toward those who have attained social self-consciousness. The remedy is in the educational and exemplary inculcation of the principles of rational control. And, in an evolutionary society, reason must sooner or later infallibly prove its superiority by overcoming biological conditions and assimilating society to itself, when a new and higher social order will result. But the resistance will never be wholly eliminated. If the world's adult population were entirely rationalized, the rising generation would yet furnish occasion for the eternal vigilance which is the price of all security; and strenuous endeavor

toward the ideal ends prescribed by reason would yet be the law of social progress.

The great difficulties of social evolution do not, however, arise from the normal resistance of a lower to the introduction of a higher order of existence; but from an abnormal resistance—a resistance due to *anti-evolutionary self-determinations by the supreme controlling principle—the rational will—itself.*

I have already adverted to the fact that many men, who know the true life and their duty to live it, yet choose the base life of animal self-indulgence—a life that is not merely *not* evolutionary, and not merely *resistant* to evolution; but it is a life that involves all the powers of human nature in a more or less direct and consciously coherent *effort to subvert evolution.* In other words, as I shall now attempt to show, the base and anti-evolutionary choices that men make and have made, result in an evolution of humanity downward —a movement fitly characterized as a *counter*-evolution. This chapter will discuss the nature; the next, some of the effects, of the counter-evolution.

1. *The counter-evolution is first and fore-*

most an anti-evolutionary act. That is to say, it is an act of rational will directed against the true or evolutionary order. It is a voluntary self-determination to evil. And by evil we do not necessarily designate conduct that is inherently and essentially wrong. It may be, and perhaps more frequently is, the preference of a lower good instead of an available higher good; or the indulgence of our lower powers to excess or in a manner forbidden by reason and by the evolutionary demands of our nature. Gluttony and lust are simply the exaggerations and perversions of normal and beneficent functions.

This abnormal indulgence of our lower propensities is not, as the biological school of moralists and sociologists would have us believe, a merely natural manifestation of animal impulses, sure to be outgrown as man evolves. If man were a mere animal, then animalism would be natural to him. Or, if reason had not come to self-consciousness in due order with his advancing years, we should view his unbridled animal propensities without censure, accounting that, as he is a "natural," his conduct is natural. But we pity him, as

we do not pity the animal, because we instinctively feel that his birth as a man had destined him to something higher.

But when a normally developed man, even of the most ordinary intelligence, refuses to hear the dictates of his own reason and conscience and does what he knows is wrong, surrendering himself to appetite and lust—a thing he always, in this age of reason, knows to be wrong—then it is not a natural animalism that we see; it is the *prostitution of rational will to animalism.* It is the subversion of reason by reason's own act—its abdication of its proper dignity and authority, as lord of the animal in us, and its self-degradation to the level, and below the level, of the animal—even a self-subjection to the animalism it ought to rule. It is man voluntarily become animal; that is, bestialized.

2. Anti-evolutionary acts tend to the production of anti-evolutionary *habits.* It is unnecessary to dwell upon this familiar fact. Any unwonted act, done once, is more easily done a second time; and more easily still a third time; and so on indefinitely, till the act becomes second nature, and it becomes far

more difficult not to do it on occasion than it was to do it in the first place. Indeed, if it be a wrong act, it tends to become a bondage that no ordinary exercise of will can break.

In particular, the effect of indulging the animal propensities in defiance of the restraints of reason and the moral law, is, by abnormal use, to produce an undue development of the lower instincts, and by disuse to occasion an atrophy and paralysis of the higher powers in their normal functions, with an obvious tendency to the subjection of our entire being to its lower impulses. The habit of disobedience to conscience results at length in practically silencing the voice of conscience, and the habit of indulgence tends to confirm itself into an indispensable and unconquerable self-debauchery. This process is no part of a normal evolution. It is retrogression. The young man of pure and upright habits, who, on leaving home, falls in with a fast set, and learns to smoke and drink, and to frequent vile resorts, is not evolving; he is degenerating. And such instances are typical of all those in which man, while knowing a better way, chooses the worse.

3. Evil action, especially in its habitual stage, tends to the *subversion of faith in the true and the good.* A man who is corrupted only to the ordinary degree of standard business shrewdness, is liable to think a thoroughgoing honesty to be wholly impracticable, if not non-existent; and to regard the one who should attempt it as an innocent lamb to be fleeced by the *practical* initiates. An immoral man does not, as a rule, believe in the actual existence of virtuous men. He has lost faith in the ideal—lost his ideals themselves. Turning away from the onward and upward course of a rational evolution, he no longer sees or can see, unless by memory's faint suggestion, the Perfection that constitutes the goal of humanity. His back turned, he faces downward; and he sees before him—a gilded germ, whose promise is pleasure, but whose fruit will be corruption.

4. Evil conduct tends to pervert the rational will to the *active championship of evil.* A wicked man is never nearer to happiness than when he has succeeded in breaking down the resistance of a virtuous man, and has induced him to become a partaker with him in

his sin. Or, this being impracticable, when he has led astray and ruined the son of such a man. Intemperance and lust are infernally ingenious in giving a seductive front to their vile haunts; and the panderers to vice know very well how to employ social and political organization to defeat wholesome legislation, and to subject community, state, and nation to the contamination of their iniquitous traffic.

Sin is, thus, in its more gross and common forms, not only the animalizing of human reason; it is also in a manner the rationalizing of the animalized human resistance to the evolutionary life. Reason is naturally a dominant, aggressive, organizing principle; and, when allied to evil, it retains its character to the extent of seeking, even by comprehensive organization, to subdue mankind to the dominion of evil.

5. The evil-doer not only perverts his own character; he also *transmits the evil disposition and tendencies to his posterity;* and that not alone by the law of inheritance, but equally by his example and personal influence. And the example and influence extend to his whole social environment. Thus it is plain that no

man born of sinning parents comes into the world under the normal conditions of the evolutionary life. He labors under the incubus of an inherited trend to animalism. His reason lacks its normal fidelity to evolutionary ideals; has an abnormal tendency to tolerance of evil; has lost its strenuous aggressiveness and keen temper; and has relapsed into the languor and indisposition to effort, especially to effort in the right direction, that is characteristic of self-indulgence.

But not only the reason, the physical nature also, of offspring, is involved in the degeneration. It is not so strong nor so active and energetic as it would have been if sprung from a normal parentage. It is grosser, has more of the animal in its nature and adaptations than it should have had; presents an easier mark for temptation, a less apt and efficient equipment for overcoming temptation.

It is plain that a child born under such conditions will find it far harder to live a right life than it ought to be, and under normal conditions would be. It is harder in two ways—he has more to do, and less to do with.

And there is no likelihood that, with his less disposed nature and inferior resources, he will do better than his parents did before him. Naturally, he will do worse ; and his children will be born, and will live, farther down the stream of moral degeneration than he.

Thus the surrender of reason to the lower impulses marks the beginning of an evolution, which, since the reason has abdicated, proceeds in strict accordance with biological laws—the laws of habit, of influence, of inheritance, of growth—and determines man, *no longer self-determined*, steadily toward the goal of irrational conduct :—first, the individual, and then in due course his posterity and an expanding circle of acquaintances and neighbors and their posterity. It is the law of organic development—the same law operating in society, that, when a germ of disease is implanted in the human body, sends its virus, ever multiplying, throughout the system, and hurries it onward at an ever accelerating pace toward dissolution.

6. The evidence that society is suffering from such base choices, continually made and forever propagating themselves, lies at every

man's door; nay, in every man's consciousness. We do not rise to higher and better things with the joyful spontaneity of the evolutionary life. The overcoming of temptation, and of the resistance to moral evolution within us, is a hard struggle, and not the jubilant self-mastery of superabounding strength and unhesitating integrity, as it would be if the evolutionary spirit and fiber were whole within us.

And when we reflect how often men fall into sin; and how often, once fallen, they do not seem to care to rise again, but are content to wallow in their filth, our jails and prisons, and the dark areas of intemperance and lust and crime, and of places dedicated to the ministry of intemperance and lust and crime, in all our large towns, bear melancholy testimony.

And the evidence is conclusive that this state of things is not sporadic or local. It is not worse under our direct observation than in more distant communities. It is as bad, or worse, in every community of any size the sun shines upon. And history reveals no brighter picture.

From all of which, and especially from the universality of moral evil throughout the recorded history of mankind, two inferences are obvious :—

First, that the subversion of the rational will of man by an evil choice took place *very early*. It must have taken place, originally, either in different places widely removed from each other and without any community of action or influence, among men acting quite independently; or it must have taken place before the general dispersion of the race. The difficulty of accounting for the origin of an evil choice by an evolutionary being, leads us to prefer the second hypothesis. The "fall" took place before the dispersion, when man had not yet reached his present stage of development.

Secondly, since sin came into the world very early, it seems not unreasonable to suppose, that the world's disaster was caused by the base choice of the *first being* so endowed with reason as to entitle him to the designation, Man ; or, at any rate, in the first family. The word Adam, which an old Hebrew record gives as the name of the first man, is

simply *man*, and it is applied to both sexes in Genesis 5, 2:—"He called their name Adam."

On this hypothesis, the first sin is pushed back to the point where the dominance of reason over the lower forms of control was not yet fairly established. Human experience was virtually at the zero point; and, although the evolutionary voice spoke distinctly against the surrender to appetite, yet the lack of experience, both of such commands and of the consequences of disregarding them, may have left our first parents in a dreamy haze of dawning light morally, that would account for their choosing a peculiarly agreeable self-indulgence, even though knowing that it was wrong. In this way, the evolution theory of the origin of man accounts for the existence of a downward trend in him, which is not merely animalism, but is a *subjection of reason* to animal proclivities: a tendency very hard adequately to account for in any other way.

But when the subversion of the authority of the rational will and the giving over of man to animal impulse, is traced on rational principles to our first parents; then the universality of sin, and the outworking results of

sin, in the human race, are merely a matter of biological evolution—as inevitable, if mankind were to be perpetuated, as the development of the acorn into the oak, rather than into another species of tree.

CHAPTER XII

Consequences of the Counter-Evolution

A MOST obvious consequence is, that *all human history has been a conflict between two directly antagonistic evolutions*—the upward and the downward. Every human being finds himself rising to self-consciousness in the mingling currents of these opposing streams, and obliged to decide for himself in which direction he will move. Every community is a seat of moral war, in which there are no neutrals, but all are involved in incessant conflict. The triumph of either party means, not that the other party is annihilated, but that it is nursing its principles and drilling its forces in secret, in order that it may some day come forth to open conflict and a possible victory. History records a gradual advance and triumph of the upward evolution—a gradual expulsion of the forces of evil from the strongholds fortified and maintained by them from time immemo-

rial. But it is only eternal vigilance and the superior power and organization of the Right that compasses this result—a result, however, that in the aggregate seems pitifully small and unsatisfactory when the time and cost of the conflict are taken into the account.

It is to be hoped that a new era is dawning —an era in which the accelerating movement of the world-process shall result in a perceptible hastening of the dragging chariot-wheels of human progress—a time when, the world open and accessible as never before, and the forces of moral evolution organized, equipped, and aggressive as never before, there will be a general collapse of the organized resistance and a general advance of the lines of righteousness and truth such as the world has never seen.

2. The subversion of rational will by the baser impulses, and the consequent domination of society in large measure by the laws of the biological organism, has resulted in the *predominance in society of biological, as distinguished from rational, phenomena;* and in this way, no doubt, has given a biological character to most of the recent sociological and

ethical theories. It is undoubtedly true that society is, in general, governed by natural impulses; that the morality of most men is at bottom a matter of feeling. And scientific men must and do recognize these facts. But they are in error, I must believe, in treating these facts as finalities. They ought to have a more vital faith in their own doctrine of evolution. They ought to have seen that, while society may have originated and grown up under the blind following of a high grade of animal instincts, such was not necessarily its ultimate and ideal character. They ought to have seen that man has within him the elements of a higher development; a development to which these early forms are merely preliminary and preparatory, and to which they will at last become subservient. They ought to have perceived that man is normally an evolution from heteronomy to autonomy; that, however long postponed the goal may be or whatever setbacks may be experienced, the end is sure to be attained at last; and that the final stage of social evolution, and not the provisional stages, determines the real nature of society. And that final stage is the stage

of freedom—the stage in which men are self-determined to action in accordance with considerations furnished by Reason.

And precisely so in Ethics. Whatever its antecedents may have been, the ultimate evolutionary conception—the conception that characterizes, or ought to characterize, ethical science—is the self-determination of the individual and of society to harmony with the evolutionary scheme of things, the ideal scheme being rationally apprehended and voluntarily adopted.

3. The universal diffusion of the results of evil conduct through the immemorial operation of biological laws, brings it to pass that no human being ever attains to the maturity of a rational self-determination without sooner or later *voluntarily transgressing* the law of his evolutionary nature, conceived of in its highest or ethical character. The nature with which we are born, being degenerate in character and tendency through the effect of ancestral transgression, and also lacking the normal overcoming force ; it is sure to give way under temptation. And it does give way. "There is no man that liveth and sinneth not," is an

ancient judgment whose justification is in every man's conscience and in every man's experience. Even the ignorant and degraded savage knows that he is a sinner. And in proportion as men rise in intelligence, the more clearly do they perceive and the more surely do they know that they have transgressed the law of their being. The doctrine of sin; atonements and propitiations of some sort; altars and sacrifices; priesthoods and intercessors; anticipations of heaven or hell, of rewards and punishments according to conduct;—all these being practically universal among men in some form or other—bespeak man conscious of being a sinner.

4. The most prevalent, most obdurate, and, on the whole, most disastrous, consequence of the counter-evolution is the *moral deadness* of men—their unresponsiveness to evolutionary motives and appeals. Men who are not criminals or vicious, but whose lives are both outwardly and inwardly upright, are yet, as a rule, in the grip of an unconquerable moral stagnation. The things we know we ought to do—the character we know we ought to win—are not the things we most delight to

do and do spontaneously, as they would be if our natures were normal. The good we would, we do not, because we are too lazy to exert ourselves. Moral achievement and self-subjugation, for the sake of the good above us, are not easy. The path of ethical development is a steep up-grade. We dread the struggle, and prefer to let ourselves drift with the popular tide of the society in which we move. But drifting is not an advance movement. It is moral retrogression. It is the palpable manifestation of a spiritual gangrene that is insiduously but surely eating out the fiber of character. It is the paralysis of rational will through its abnormal subjection to non-rational impulse and feeling.

The essentially evil nature of this moral torpor is specially manifest in its relation to the labors of those persons who are actively endeavoring to promote the moral evolution of society. The greatest obstacle they meet with is, not the grossness of outbreaking sin, for that is the argument that gives them the victory, but it is the do-nothing indifference of respectable people. The most thoroughly efficient servants any evil cause has in this

world are the reputably good people, who, although to be sure they do not believe in the evil in question, will yet do nothing against it. And every one who attacks it must count on carrying his cause in spite of these good people, whose unresponsiveness and timid doubts and carping criticisms will weigh down upon him like the living carcass of an old man of the sea. The reason is, they lack the normal evolutionary character of humanity. They are morally dead—petrified by sin, in its race character as the counter-evolution, and in its individual character as unlikeness to the moral order of the evolutionary scheme.

5. The last consequence of the counter-evolution that I shall mention is the *necessity of the restoration of rational will* to the supreme control of human life, individual and collective, before man or society can hope to attain to a truly evolutionary character and destiny. The reason must vindicate its authority over the animal propensities; and the will, renouncing its slavery to these animal instincts, must refuse to yield itself to any control but that of reason.

This means a fundamental *change of nature*, in the sense that the corruption of nature, to

which we are heirs through our connection with an animalized or sinful race, must give way to our true nature, as evolutionary beings dominated by rational will.

But such a change from an abnormal to a normal *nature*, or fundamental character, means a complete transformation of all the dominant motives and tendencies of life. Every thought, feeling, and volition, having received a peculiar character of its own antagonistic to its true or evolutionary character, by reason of its origin in a race of men corrupted from of old by a dominant counter-evolutionary trend—by reason of an immemorial equilibration with an animalized environment;—must be transformed by the restoration of reason as its controlling principle, and by life-long equilibration with a rationalized or evolutionary environment. In short, the biological conception, that by its dominance has debauched humanity, must yield to the rational conception, which alone can lift it up and send it rejoicing on its upward course.

THE RESTORATION OF CONTROL

CHAPTER XIII

Evolution the Prevailing Power

WE have traced *evolution* up from a chaos of dispersed atoms through several distinct stages. We have seen the atoms aggregated by gravitation into systems of worlds. We have seen our earth compounded by chemical action, clothed with vegetable life, and peopled with living creatures. We have seen man appear, the last and highest of the creatures. And we have seen human society and the human individual advancing together, through an infancy and youth of gradually modified subjection, to a maturity of rational self-determination.

On the other hand, we have seen that human nature in its whole extent has been perverted and corrupted by some base self-determination of our earliest human ancestors; that somehow, in that ancient evil choice, the rational will—characteristic of humanity—was dragged from its primal dignity and made the

minister of our lower impulses; that thus there was implanted in the race the vital germ of a degeneration, tending, through the organic operation of the laws of life, to an ever broadening and ever deepening animalization of the human species, and constituting an abnormal and destructive *counter-evolution.*

The mutual relations of these two evolutions, and the outcome of their conflict, for the individual and for society, is the grand problem of history—the problem of the war of good with evil—which constitutes a basal fact in the consciousness of every human civilization. We have to consider it merely in its aspect as control—as the warfare of a sovereign authority divided against itself—as the conflict between rational will, normal and asserting its evolutionary prerogative, on the one hand, and rational will, corrupted to the service of our "brute inheritance," on the other. We shall notice, first, the prevailing power and destined triumph of evolution; secondly, some human conditions of that triumph; and lastly, the objective or superhuman conditions. In this chapter I notice the superiority of evolution to the counter-evolution.

It would seem, to one who allows himself to contemplate only the power and scope of the counter-evolution, that the evil which has corrupted every man; which has inoculated every human being in the very springs of his existence with the germinal virus of death; and which by its essentially evolutionary nature (perverted by evil, but not destroyed) is, and by its history is shown to be, adapted for universal conquest:—it would seem that such a principle, to a certain extent already master of all men, must complete its triumph. If evolution could not keep it out when it had no footing at all, how will it drive it out now that it is thoroughly intrenched on every foot of evolutionary territory? Moreover, there is a traditional maxim of ominous import, that a house divided against itself cannot stand. And thus the logic of the situation points to the final overwhelming triumph of evil.

But facts are mightier than logic. As we scrutinize history, we perceive that there has been progress from the beginning—progress in all departments of human activity, physical, mental, and moral—and that not a fitful and

paroxysmal progress, liable to disastrous reaction; but slow, from the first painfully slow, even secular, yet from age to age gathering momentum, until at last in our day the observer does not need a powerful instrument and abstruse mathematical computations to demonstrate the motion, but he can see it with the naked eye. We can trace an advance from society's infancy, when the masses of men were in leading strings, to its maturity, when the rational will of mankind, risen at last to self-consciousness and self-determination, is asserting human rights and vindicating its own royal prerogative. And thus it is obvious that evolution has not yet culminated in dissolution; nay, that it is yet triumphantly advancing, and is yet superior to its mightiest antagonist—the revolted reason of man—or even to the sum of all antagonists—the counter-evolution of evil.

But there is still a higher point of view which is equally convincing. Is it reasonable to suppose that such a process as evolution, advancing consistently through untold millions of years and through all its preliminary stages up to man, is now at last defeated by

those very powers in man that constitute its climax and consummation? It is not credible. That — whatever it be — which has brought the world-process forward to its human stage, is not so lightly to be put to confusion by the irrational decision of some half-developed grown-up child, like our first ancestor. Evolution is a movement of irresistible momentum. By its operation, man is placed here and endowed with a power of reason and self-determination. This power he may employ as he will :—for his own advancement along the lines of evolutionary progress, or for his own destruction. He may put himself out of harmony with his environment and make himself as the trilobite and the dinosaur whose fossils mark the eons of geologic time. But he cannot defeat evolution. As soon may he hope to check the planets in their courses.

For, the power that placed and keeps the planets in their orbits is the power that made man and stamped upon his nature the necessity and obligation of an evolutionary destiny. And in the incomparable transcendence of that power lies our guarantee that evolution is superior to the counter-evolution. And we

must believe that it is immeasurably superior, even though we may never be able satisfactorily to explain how the adverse power has been able to obtain so secure and so widespread a dominance as it has in human affairs.

It seems to be the order of nature that the last and highest form of control should prove its competency, not alone by mastery of the lower orders of control, but especially by a self-mastery that extends even to the subjugation of all possible manifestations of human degeneracy and malignity. At any rate, the necessity of such demonstration is obviously imposed by the facts. And so we address ourselves to the inquiry, *how* rational will is to obtain the mastery of the organized forces of evil in the world, and especially the mastery of the evil intrenched in the animalized rational wills of men.

CHAPTER XIV

Some Human Conditions of the Triumph of Evolution

EVOLUTION in its lower stages is, of course, so far as man is concerned, automatic. The unknown Efficiency behind the world-process acts immediately in and through the atomic and molecular units to produce the marvellous order and progress which we, observing afterward, conceive to be the working out of a wonderful plan. The action of that mysterious Efficiency is no less marked in and through the individual units of mankind to produce the order and progress characteristic of society. And in much—namely, in all that springs out of the lower orders of control, as in the organic nature of society—the operation of that supreme Power is without any self-conscious human coöperation. The type, pattern, or idea is established antecedently in nature; and man, without knowing the type; without knowing that there

is such a thing; without conscious reference to any comprehensive plan of human evolution; but simply obeying the impulsion of the natural forces within him—the molecular forces of the human unit—he spontaneously and blindly, like any other molecular unit, works out the realization of that antecedent idea, for himself and for society. So far as we can judge, the major part of human history up to date has been determined thus by the blind operation of the subrational forces of human nature.

It is only when we come to the last form of control—the rational will of man—that there is direct human coöperation with the evolutionary Power. In earlier stages of the world-process the sovereign Power itself wrought in and through the atomic units; now man also works. We may, indeed, say, that the operations of rational will itself are an operation of the sovereign Power, qualified only by the nature of the unit in and through which it acts, precisely as in the earlier stages of evolution. Only, in this case, the sovereign Power acts through the rational self-determinations of free beings. And such beings *can*

assert themselves against the nature and destiny marked out for them by the Power above, if they will, as the atoms, molecules, and vital germs cannot; or, they may choose to walk, as best they may, in the path marked out for them in the evolutionary process.

This distinctive fact, which characterizes the ultimate form of cosmic control—the rational will of man—suggests the *methods* by which the counter-evolution is to be remedied; if, indeed, it ever is to be remedied. As the downward trend of humanity is due to a perversion of rational will which in its nature is a voluntary self-determination of individual men to evil; so, the only form of control competent to meet and overcome that evil trend, as it is the only form adapted to the supreme control of man, is the rational will itself. If there is at all a hope of the restoration of an evolutionary trend to a sinning man or a sinning race, it must be in and through a *correction of rational will* which, in its nature, is a *voluntary self-determination of individual men toward the ideal right.* And if the wills of men shall be exerted along the lines of right, then the concurrent energy of the cosmic

movement contains the suggestion of a hope, over and above what we have already noted, that men may rise out of the degradation and demoralization of moral evil into the evolutionary life—of a hope that evolution may prevail against the counter-evolution.

Such a correction of rational will may be effected, if at all, only as each man corrects his own wrong tendencies. But each individual may also exert his influence to induce others to adopt the right life; and a number of like-minded persons may constitute themselves a society for the same purpose.

1. A first condition of the triumph of evolution is, that the *individual* human being shall definitely renounce and abandon every anti-evolutionary trait, disposition, or tendency, of any sort, in thought, feeling, or action; and *commit himself unreservedly in all respects to the living of the evolutionary life* and the attainment of evolutionary ideals. As the character of society is the resultant of the integrated characters of the men composing it, the existence of an evolutionary society necessarily postulates the existence of evolutionary individuals. Moreover, it is

a fact that no thoughtful person will question, that if the paramount motive of an individual life is truly evolutionary, there will be no place in that life for an anti-evolutionary act of any description. The dominant purpose will rule it out. The world is not to be delivered from evil by people who are "on the fence"; or by people who are on both sides of the fence; but only by those who are committed in all respects to the living of the evolutionary life, and to the overcoming of all, in themselves and in society, that is against that life.

The change of the individual from the corrupted life into which we are born to the evolutionary life, since human nature is degenerate and perverted in every power by our connection with a sinful race,—our ideals degraded, the wings of aspiration clipped,—is a change which, while it is sure to be approved by reason and conscience—our evolutionary self-consciousness—is equally sure to be a matter of extreme difficulty. The stern repression of our lower self-indulgent proclivities; the unflinching reversal of life-long habits of thought, feeling, and action, by a

will pampered to a state of semi-paralysis and in behalf of ideals more than half believed to be impracticable — is a change so arduous and so distasteful as to demand an honesty, earnestness, and inflexibility of purpose rarely to be found and properly belonging only to a normal and uncorrupted rational will.

This change means, for example, for the business man, the substitution of thorough honesty for some commonly current business methods, as the replacing of *caveat emptor* by a principle that would protect purchaser and seller alike. It means for the citizen, loyalty to right instead of to party; for men in general, purity, in word and thought as well as action; purity in association—the keeping of the eyes sacred from that which would contaminate the heart; the guarding of the mind from evil imaginations; of the lips from corrupting words; of the mouth from the entrance of the unclean; of the feet from the ways of death:—that it might be said of each one, relative to all evil, as was said, by a contemporary, of John Smith of Virginia fame, relative to some evils: "I never knew

a man like thee; from wine, tobacco, debts, dice, oaths so free."

The problem of the individual is: Given certain natural appetites, passions, and desires, which have received an exaggerated power and a downward trend by inheritance and by self-chosen habit; to restrain them, to subject them to the authority of reason, and to make them subservient to the achievement of an evolutionary, or progressive and morally worthy, destiny. This is not an easy problem. But it is a problem that *must be solved*, if the moral evolution of the individual human being is ever to begin, or if the individual is ever to become an active promoter of the moral evolution of society.

2. A second human condition of the triumph of evolution is in the voluntary *self-determination of individuals*, or the employment of the supreme form of individual control, *for the restoration of other men to the evolutionary life*. And this is not merely a privilege; it is an obligation—an obligation arising out of the essential nature of man as a social being. A man has not done his duty by the world by simply becoming a worthy

man. Indeed, he has not, and can not, become a wholly worthy man himself, until he has become a helper of his fellows. We owe the most of all that makes life pleasant and profitable to what others have done—to the relations and activities of society—and we are making but a beggarly return, and taking but a beggarly view of life, if we seek only our own welfare. And accordingly we find a law operating in society, that, the nobler in disposition and character men become, the more thoroughly do they find the great end of life to consist in lifting up their fellow-men.

There are many reasons for this, perhaps all comprehended more or less directly in the unity of evolution, whether considered objectively as a plan or scheme of the universe, or as attaining to subjectivity in the social organism. In the latter view, the normal development and the health of the entire social body of humanity, and of its every part, is dependent on the normal development and the health of every other part. A deadly disease fastened upon any member, even the least, threatens, not that member alone, but the whole body.

Moral evil, or the defection of the rational will of men from the evolutionary norm, is such a deadly disease; and it behooves every man, if only in self-defense, to bestir himself to eliminate the contagion from the whole body of mankind.

3. A third human condition of the triumph of evolution is to be found in the *coöperation of society.* Society should employ its resources in educating mankind up to an evolutionary conception of life. The organic relations of men in society make this a universal interest—one, therefore, demanding a universal coöperation — an organization in furtherance of it embracing all men.

This obligation, which will naturally be acknowledged in its true largeness and aggressiveness only by persons of thoroughly evolutionary opinions and character, is yet distinctly recognized by public opinion in the United States as binding *within the limits of our national boundaries.* The great principles of morality are expected to be inculcated in the public schools; and there is provision for the education of the young against specific evils, as intemperance. The prohibition of saloons

within certain limits, especially within close proximity to public educational institutions, points in the same direction.

But when it comes to transcending national boundary lines, and endeavoring to extend the fraternal helpfulness of moral education to other peoples, far more in need of it than our own, the conditions are remarkably altered. We hear all sorts of objections to such work, all sorts of excuses for having nothing to do with it, all sorts of arguments to prove that it is and must be fruitless—that minds darkened by ignorance, idolatry and superstition cannot be enlightened; that the lowly and degraded of earth cannot be lifted up.

Such opinions and sentiments are, of course, the results of that ancient subversion of reason which constituted the counter-evolution and precipitated the race into the depths of all anti-human and anti-evolutionary selfishness and depravity. Every unprejudiced person knows *a priori* that such notions are *in toto* false; and that it is not only duty, but a practicable duty, to give the blessings of an evolutionary civilization to the whole family of man. And those who have engaged in

such labors testify that they are grandly successful. We in these days are specially admonished that such labors are necessary. For, as Rome, triumphant, went down before the onsets of outlying barbarians, so we may well find in a proselyting theosophy, and in the popular oriental whimsies of Christian Science, a threat that, if we shall not count ourselves worthy of giving a true life to the superstition-ridden East, we may thereby adjudge ourselves fit material for heathenization by the East.

Thus I have announced a *theory* of the human conditions of the triumph of evolution over the counter-evolution. I have said that the rational will—highest control in man—must apply itself in every practicable way, in the individual and in society, to counteract the downward trend of evil. The individual must choose and pursue the evolutionary life for himself with inflexible purpose, and must seek to commend it to others; and the total number, or the society, of evolutionary men must employ their aggregate resources for the cultivation of the upward trend in all men.

We may take it for granted that the employment of these supreme resources of mankind for the conquest of evil is not in any way superfluous. The living of a right life, even by one who has decided for it, is by no means easy under the most favorable conditions. It is a life of strenuous endeavor and of conflict with our natural inheritance of evil tendencies and with the vitiating influence of a corrupt environment. But more serious yet is the problem of arousing ethical convictions and purposes in those who lack them. Worldly men—men actuated by the average principles of society—are not, as a rule, seeking a better life. They are simply moving with the social tide about them. They are drifting with the current. And only a modicum of experience will be needed to convince any one that it is *very difficult* to induce men to take the resolution to stop drifting and to enter upon the life of upward endeavor.

But right-minded men may not allow themselves to be deterred by difficulties. There is an absolute moral necessity resting upon them to win their fellow-men to the evolutionary life. The success of cosmic evolution

in its final stage depends upon it. From the point of view of the world-process, the human species is a failure in just so far as this work falls short of being completely and thoroughly done. The work must extend to the limits of humanity, and be measurably successful everywhere, before the cosmic idea of Man can be said to have been realized—before evolution can be said to have prevailed in its rational stage.

But now the question arises, What evidence have we that this is not *mere* theory? What grounds are there for believing that any man will think it worth his while to undertake to reverse the whole trend of his life, and to undergo self-denials that must seem to be endless, for the sake of a right life? What, indeed, does a right life amount to, that it should be bought at such a price? Is it worth what it costs? And especially is it worth while to spend time and strength and money, that might be employed in making life comfortable, in the remote and odious task of teaching some worthless pagan to make himself miserable by aping the customs of civilization? What is the use?

The only way to remove the doubt implied in these questions, and to supply a motive rationally adequate to induce men to adopt the evolutionary life, is to prove that the right life, with all its cost, is not only the most worthy, but by far the most profitable life. It is not enough to show that it is better than the self-indulgent life. Everybody knows that. Nor is it enough to prove that it will make life healthier, and lengthen it. Everybody knows that, too. But future disease and shortening of life are vague and indefinite ills; and most men would prefer to get the good of life as they go along, and to take their chances for the future. The wicked are not the only ones to die early, and the sacrificing of the years we have, for the sake of a possible addition to their number, is not a very seductive prospect—least of all seductive to those who are wont to estimate life by the standards of self-gratification.

Indeed, for a man of average tastes and ambitions, any argument that can be presented to induce a change of life is absolutely worthless, if it be coupled with the doctrine that death is the last of us. And it ought to be

worthless. As one said long ago, "If in this life only we have hope"—we who have struggled and suffered for the sake of the true life —"we are of all men most miserable." We have lost the enjoyment of what we had, and got nothing in return.

My conclusion, therefore, is, that for the advancement of evolution the resources possessed by men and lying wholly within the power of the human rational will, while they constitute the necessary human *conditions* of evolutionary progress against the counter-evolution; yet, as the *means* of attaining such progress, they are hopelessly inadequate; and the control of society (and of the individual as well) is turned to irretrievable confusion, unless evolution itself shall furnish us resources immeasurably superior to any or all that we possess.

In other words, to define the situation more exactly, the rational stage of evolution is a failure and the counter-evolution is a triumphant success, unless science can place at our disposal conclusive proofs that the unfolding plan of the universe has destined the righteous to a future incomparably more desirable than that which awaits the wicked. Or, rather, since

a mere failure to achieve gain would be of little moment to people whose ruling passion is, not achievement, but self-indulgence; science, to establish a winning argument for evolution, must show that wickedness is sure to end in overwhelming and intolerable ruin, while righteousness tends necessarily and always to success and happiness.

To speak still more specifically, science must make it appear that men, at death, are not ceasing to exist, but are rather entering upon an immortal existence, and that the character of that existence is to be determined by the nature of our choices here on earth. If it shall do this with a reasonable degree of certainty, then there is placed at the disposal of moral evolution a Damascus blade of argument keen enough, when wisely wielded, to penetrate the densest armor of logic or indifference, and to arouse the pleasure-seeking soul to consciousness.

The following words quoted at second hand from the distinguished naturalist and evolutionist, Alfred R. Wallace, are directly to the point:—"If all men without exception ever come to believe that there is no life beyond

this life, if children are all brought up to believe that the only happiness they can ever enjoy will be upon this earth—then, it seems to me, the condition of man would be altogether hopeless, because there would cease to be any adequate motive for justice, for liberty, for unselfishness, and no sufficient reason could be given to the poor man, the bad man, or to the selfish man why he should not systematically seek his own personal welfare at the cost of others." "Such a hell upon earth as would thus be brought about will happily never exist, because it would be founded upon a falsehood, and because there are causes now at work that forbid a disbelief in man's spiritual nature and his continued existence after death." "The World To-day," June, 1903, p. 802.

CHAPTER XV

The Doctrine of Immortality

WE have seen that moral evolution, both individual and social, is an inevitable failure unless the doctrine of individual immortality can be established. This chapter aims to present some of the evidence bearing on that question. Farther on, it will also be necessary to note more definitely what science has to say relative to the nature of the Power behind evolution, and to indicate some of the relations of that Power to the reinstatement of normal control in human society.

Can the immortality of man be established? Can it be shown that if a man die he shall live again? This question, fundamental in ethics and in sociology, I will now attempt, as best I may, to answer.

Obviously, it is not sufficient to allege in reply a *belief* that man is immortal. Nor, on the other hand, is it necessary that we should

have had a personal experience of the future life, or personal converse with those who have gone on before—both of which grounds of certification must be conceded to be beyond the reach of the great majority, at least, of thinking men. Neither experience, nor testimony derived from experience, is available to prove the immortality of the soul.

But this need not seriously affect the case. Demonstration is not essential to any of the sciences, save those that are primarily mathematical. And even there it is not always required in cases beyond the possibility of applying the tests. Scientists believe in cosmic evolution, not from experience, or from hearsay, or from demonstration; but from analogy, and from the fruitfulness of that theory in harmonizing and unifying the phenomena of the universe, and in serving as a clue to the discovery of new and valuable truth. The same is true of the gravitation theory, and of the undulatory theory of light.

And precisely so the theory of immortality, if it shall in manifold ways prove its concinnity with human nature; if it shall show itself to be in harmony with the largest and best de-

velopment of all our powers, in their due subordination to one another and to the total organic and functional life of the individual; if it shall assign to the individual his true place in society; and, above all, if it shall furnish to man a truly evolutionary motive, and point man to his true place in the evolutionary scheme, and especially if it shall prove to be indispensable to the consummation of cosmic evolution in its highest or rational stage:—then immortality will have taken its place, along with other verified theories, among the established doctrines of science. Without formally undertaking the proof, for which time and space are lacking, I will mention—necessarily with little elaboration—a few facts that must, when duly weighed, go very far toward giving to the doctrine of immortality the character of scientific truth.

John Fiske, in his "Life Everlasting," paves the way for the consideration of such facts. While he does not undertake to prove immortality, he does, as he says, "certainly remove the only serious objection that has ever been alleged against it" (p. 80). "How could immortal man have been produced through hered-

ity from an ephemeral brute?" is his question. To this question he replies:—

"The most proper answer is a frank confession of ignorance. Whether it be in the individual or in the race, we cannot tell just where the soul comes in. The maxim that nature makes no leaps is far from true. Nature's habit is to make prodigious leaps, but only after long preparation. Slowly rises the water in the tank, inch by inch through many a weary hour, until at length it overflows, and straightway vast systems of machinery are awakened into rumbling life. Slowly grows the eccentricity of the ellipse as you shift its position in the cone, and still the nature of the curve is not essentially varied, when suddenly, presto! one more little shift, and the finite ellipse becomes an infinite hyperbola, mocking our feeble powers of conception as it speeds away on its everlasting career" (pp. 84, 85).

Fiske's argument is, that the absence of evidence proves nothing where from the nature of the case evidence is unattainable; evidence for the immortality of the soul is from the nature of the case unattainable; therefore we may accept the doctrine without any necessary vio-

lation of reason. *Faith* may abide, though there be no substantial foundation for faith in the rational judgment of thinking men.

I am inclined to think that if our belief in immortality, or in any or all other of the doctrines of religion, is to abide in any such shadowy cloud-land of mysticism as is thus provided for it; and if it shall not be able to descend into the arena of rational debate, where it may touch bucklers on equal terms with the polemic dogmas of science:—then its days are numbered, and our grandchildren will be obliged to look for it—where we look for the faith of simpler days, in the sprites and gnomes and elves of poetic fable, or for the personified abstractions of Comte's metaphysical stage of human progress—among the cobwebs in some disused corner of the antiquarian's curiosity-shop.

But I am persuaded that no such fate awaits our faith in immortality. The experience philosophy does not cut us off from a knowledge of the verities of the "unseen world," though most of its great expounders have so maintained. Fiske himself, though voicing the traditional judgment of that school, was

yet a believer in immortality, and in various passages in his later philosophical writings he expressed the very decided conviction that that judgment is not final; while in the concluding paragraph of his "Life Everlasting"—the little book that gave the very latest expression to his convictions on this point—he says: "I hope enough has been said to indicate the probability that the patient study of evolution is likely soon to supply the basis for a Natural Theology more comprehensive, more profound, and more hopeful than could formerly have been imagined." The author of these cheering words missed realizing the achievement which he anticipated only, I am confident, because death placed a period to his earthly labors.

The traditional opinion that faith in the doctrines of religion rests upon a different basis of certification from that upon which faith in the doctrines of science rests; that religious faith somehow stands alone, while faith in the verities of science rests upon evidence,—is a mistake. The weighing of evidence belongs equally to both. And the evidence for immortality is entirely as real and as attainable

as is the evidence for many of the more recondite truths of science—the atomic constitution of matter, the conservation and correlation of physical forces, the existence of an interstellar ether, etc. Our knowledge on all these points is a knowledge, not of noumena, but of phenomena; and it is a knowledge of phenomena each of which, as a rule, has but an infinitesimal and remote suggestion of the grand doctrine to which it is contributory. From a multitude of such phenomena, and from the observed relations of the phenomena to each other and to the human mind, the observer deduces and formulates a truth of science. Because the phenomena *cohere* together, and especially if all the phenomena relevant to the subject-matter cohere into a harmonious system, and if this comprehensive coherence of phenomena *persists*, so that the mind cannot rid itself of it by any permutations of the phenomena together, or in conjunction with other and extraneous phenomena;—then we say that we *know* the truth to which these comprehensively cohering phenomena point, and we rely upon it as an established doctrine of science, especially after

it has borne the test of time and constant use.

Precisely so we attain to a knowledge of immortality. And the phenomena that point to immortality (some of which I shall indicate) —phenomena of the individual and social life of man—are as numerous, as coherent, and as comprehensively coherent, as are the phenomena lying at the basis of any one of the physical sciences; and the appeal of these phenomena to our rational consciousness is as persistent, and every way as satisfactory and as convincing, as is the appeal of any class of phenomena. And thus the doctrine of immortality is as scientific as any law of physics or chemistry. It is only by ruling the phenomena of human life, intellectual and moral, out of court that this conclusion is to be avoided. We may deny our knowledge of a material universe, as some philosophers have done, just as reasonably as we can deny our knowledge of the immortality of the human soul.

The comprehensive coherence of the phenomena pointing to immortality is established by *showing that they are evolutionary in their nature and tendencies.* If man is helped on-

ward toward the goal of his evolutionary destiny by any fact whatever, then that fact is part and parcel of the evolutionary scheme of things; and the coherence of all such facts is established in and by the already established coherence of evolution, precisely as the coherence of the facts of the physical sciences is established by their connection with evolution. And the persistence in consciousness of the phenomena of religion, as of the phenomena of science, is established in the same way —by the connection of those phenomena with evolution. But for ordinary people there has been for thousands of years a doctrine of human evolution by which ethical and religious phenomena have been tested—a doctrine constituting the natural crown and completion of the more comprehensive modern theory of evolution; a doctrine, however, that has had a very inhospitable greeting from the philosophers—no greeting at all, in fact, from most of them—insomuch that one of the most advanced, fairest minded, and most luminous thinkers of them all never had, apparently, more than a faint prophetic adumbration of its existence.

Among the phenomena pointing to immortality I mention the following:

1. *The true life of man is a pursuit of ideals.*

But what are ideals? Not mere foolish fancies. They are, consciously or unconsciously, a recognition of the evolutionary or upward tendency of a normal human life—a testimony of human nature to its faith that the future has in store for us something indefinitely better than we have ever yet attained. In imagination we project ourselves forward into the remote future toward the goal of evolution, and revel in its pictures of glory and beauty. Not, indeed, that we always consciously recognize it as the goal of evolution: for ideals are often vividly present to those who have no knowledge whatever of evolution. Nay, ideals are rather the spontaneous manifestation of our evolutionary nature in the souls of those who are least sophisticated in the wisdom of the world—the unconscious self-expression of innocence and truth.

And the contemplation of these bright pictures incites us to high endeavor—why? Because we like to chase pots of gold at rainbow ends? By no means. It is because we in-

stinctively know that the true life of man is one of *lofty* aspiration. It is because there is that within us which cannot rest satisfied with any possible attainments of threescore years and ten, or thrice threescore years and ten; which revolts against the thought that we were born to perish like the beasts; and which tells us that our life is true just in proportion as it rises above the transient commonplace of earth and regulates its endeavors by ideals derived from the heavenly and the eternal.

2. *Human nature at its best claims the right to a belief in immortality.*

Those men who have made the most of the doctrine of immortality have been the best men. Men who are pursuing evil practices, and men who are wholly engrossed in worldly gain or pleasure, do not for such purposes need, and do not want, the doctrine. Its suggestions are too ominous of retribution for squandered and abused opportunities.

But good men want it. They want it when they are prosperous, because they know how defective earthly happiness is, and how transient at the best; and they love to think that

when they are called upon to leave the fleeting joys of earth, they will find awaiting them a paradise where prosperity shall be unalloyed by any mixture of evil or imperfection, and where peace and joy shall reign forevermore. To those who are weary with life's burden, the thought of a day of rest comes with a message of inexpressible relief. To the tried and tempted, the afflicted, the sick, and the sorrowing, there is strength and consolation in the assurance that they shall shortly reach a land where there is no more sin and no more pain, where the tears shall be wiped from every eye, and where there shall be no more death.

These thoughts have not tended to diminish the earnestness and strenuousness of life. Exactly the reverse. They have inspired men to heroic endeavor and self-sacrifice, and to the patient bearing of life-long burdens that had no earthly recompense; and all because they believed in their hearts that, if life's battle shall be worthily fought and life's duties well done, there will be an eternal victory and reward.

3. Generally speaking, *all men believe in an immortal life beyond the grave.* I will quote

again from Fiske's "Life Everlasting" (pp. 37, 38).

"The belief in a future life, in a world unseen to mortal eyes, is not only coeval with the beginnings of the human race, but is also coextensive with it in all its subsequent stages of development. It is, in short, one of the differential attributes of humanity. Man is not only the primate who possesses articulate speech and the power of abstract reasoning, who is characterized by a long period of plastic infancy and a corresponding capacity for progress, who is grouped in societies of which the primordial units were clans; he is not only all this, but he is the creature who expects to survive the event of physical death. This expectation was one of the acquisitions gained while attaining to the human plane of existence."

Elsewhere in the same book (p. 47), after speaking of some earlier objectors to the doctrine, he says: "Even to-day we may sometimes be entertained by a belated eighteenth century naturalist who is fully persuaded that his denial of human immortality is an inevitable corollary from the doctrine of evolution."

4. *Belief in immortality is a practical necessity of evolution.*

In its moral stage evolution is inevitably a failure apart from such belief. The counter-evolution is established in every human life in paralyzing and destroying power. And now that the belief in immortality is all but universal, if the certainty of a future state of rewards and punishments answerable to character fails to deter a vast majority of men from evil conduct, what must we expect would be the result if this belief were done away, and if men were convinced that present good is the only sure good, and that the sure way to get present enjoyment is the best way, and that no one need to concern himself about a judgment to come, because there is to be none? Is it not plain that every evil impulse would have an added rein given to it? That every good motive, every incentive to the conquest of evil, would lose an important element of encouragement? And that evolutionary morality, which now advances to the conquest of humanity so slowly, so haltingly, and so uncertain of definite achievements, would be involved at once in overwhelming discouragement and unavoidable disaster?

5. The doctrine of immortality *establishes the sanctity of the human personality*, and the inviolability of the evolutionary law within us that we name conscience, or the categorical imperative of duty.

It is obvious enough, if the decisions of today are to determine our eternal destiny, that it is vastly more important for us to choose and act aright than it is for us to preserve our earthly life. So conscience speaks to us, not by way of counsel or advice, but by way of a command. It bids us *do right*, and that not as a matter of convenience or of expediency, but of moral necessity—of irremissible obligation. It bids us do right, not merely under favoring circumstances and because we think we can improve our condition by it, but also when the circumstances are unfavorable and even when it is sure to cost us the loss of all earthly good. It bids us do right without wavering, without compromise, and at all hazards. And if *for any cause* we fail to obey its high behest, it lays upon us the whips and stings of a remorseful self-contempt. It adjudges us unworthy of ourselves. And why?

For no other reason but because right con-

duct—character—is an eternal possession and worth infinitely more to him who has it than all the wealth of the world. And he who should barter character for any transient earthly gain—even for life—must feel within him the consciousness that he, like Lucifer, has precipitated himself, through the whole diameter of the moral universe, from the heights of heaven down to hell.

Those men and women, therefore, who in olden times chose rather to go to the lions than to burn a pinch of incense to Jupiter or Bacchus, were not fanatics blinded by a foolish enthusiasm. They were wise and level-headed people. Their eyes had been opened to the true values of things. They knew that right is of infinite worth, because it is the beginning of an eternal life; and that sin, however insignificant in outward seeming, is infinite disaster, because it is the starting-point of an eternal perdition. They counted not their lives dear unto them, that they might win the goal of true living; and who can doubt that they won it? Or that the immortal galaxy of Chinese and Armenian heroes, who, but a few short weeks or months agone, displaying the same

unconquerable heroism, achieved in death the crowning triumph of their lives?

Thus the doctrine of immortality, combined with the doctrine of evolution, gives us an *ideal of manhood.* It is that of a man who hears and obeys the call of his evolutionary nature, commanding him to direct the whole power of his life to the achievement, for himself and others, of the Best; and who, in the pursuit of these high ends, follows the leading of his rational will with a self-determined persistency commensurable with the importance of eternity, as eternity is compared with time.

Such a man, though physically weak, has a manhood that, in its moral self-consciousness and moral self-determination, is so identified with the eternal true and right constituting the ideal goal of moral evolution, as to be morally practically independent of all social opinions or ordinances—so independent as to stand in no imperative need of social coöperation for the support of his moral purposes; so independent as to be able, if necessary, to be true to those purposes in defiance of the united opposition of the world. Such men, masters of themselves and of circumstances,

morally mightier than the world in which they live, constitute a class by themselves—the class of heroic men—to whom the incense of humanity's praise and imitation is ever ascending, testifying that the common consciousness of mankind finds in them a nobler character and worthier example than is to be found in the average of men.

6. The doctrine of *immortality in its relation to the counter-evolution* gives a result that commends itself to the general judgment of mankind.

The Christian doctrine of an eternal hell, variously designated as "everlasting punishment," a "lake of fire," "eternal destruction," etc., has of late years been criticised as intolerably severe, and incompatible with any beneficent government of the universe. "It was only in a cruel age," says a recent writer, "that the doctrine of hell-fire could have acquired that hold upon men's minds which it had acquired in the Middle Ages." It "had acquired" a hold of men's minds in the Middle Ages. Let us see how far that hold must be relaxed.

What is the counter-evolution? It is the

subordination of reason to inclination; the exaltation of self-indulgence above right doing. And the essential nature of such conduct is evil. It is a violation of the normal conditions of human life—the internal relations are thrown out of harmony with the external relations; man is thrown out of harmony with environment. And by reason of the germinal and evolutionary nature of evil action this discord with environment is a growing discord. Before very long the pleasures lose their zest, and at last they end in pain. Disease lays hold upon the body; the mind loses its bright and holy ideals and becomes corrupted; the conscience, so often insulted and trodden under foot, ceases to protest. It does not take very many years for this downward tendency to result in the filth of body and mind, the blasphemy, the rottenness of disease, the vice, the crime, the comfortless poverty, stolid wretchedness and hopeless degradation that are characteristic of the slums in all our large cities. And how many young men and young women, setting out full of hope and promise from beautiful homes, have listened to the tempter's voice and plunged to the bottom of

this pit of perdition in a few short months! *Facilis descensus Averni.*

And now suppose the boundaries of time removed from this downward evolution. Instead of a few short years for sin to gather its fruitage, there are centuries—millenniums—eternity! Death, supposedly not working any transformation of moral character, will simply mark an early stage in the downward progress. Who can form a conception of what the end of that self-chosen degradation shall be? Shall it be pains and tribulation as much greater than those of earthly transgression as eternity is greater than time? Who, knowing the reign of law in human lives, can venture to deny it? If it is nature's law of progress that those who sow shall reap, even on earth, thirty, sixty, and a hundredfold; if those who sow the wind shall here reap the whirlwind; if those who sow to the flesh shall reap corruption—what, for those who sow thus, shall be the garnered harvest of eternity? What shall the end be—not by the arbitrary judgments of a wrathful Deity, but by the inevitable operation of natural law?

Whatever the exact nature of that horrible

goal of sin may be; if—as every scientific man must believe—nature's laws will remain in the future as they have been in the past, then the eternal outcome of moral evil will be inconceivably dreadful. It may as well be called a lake of fire as anything else.

And what of the possibility and hope of a future restoration to those who die in the counter-evolution? It is a hope based, not upon the rational interpretation of nature's laws, but upon the tendency to self-indulgence that constitutes sin. In all rational probability it is self-deception. He who is unwilling to break away from a self-pleasing life here and now—what reason has he for supposing that he will ever be willing? The longer a habit is continued, the stronger it always becomes. And, on other grounds, it is quite unlikely that the circumstances hereafter will be as favorable to change as now. Evil always tends to segregate itself from the good. Evil men associate themselves together apart from the good, and fortify themselves in their isolation and in their antagonism to the good. This is the evolutionary tendency. And thus an evolutionary course of life is reversible only in

its beginnings. The drops of rain falling on a watershed may easily be directed into either of two opposite flowing streams; but after the decision is made, and the drops have mingled themselves in the current of a flowing river, there is no more possibility of return.

The doctrine of hell has, I think, had so large a place in the convictions of mankind because, in spite of all difficulties, men have had an intuitive persuasion that sin plus eternity is equal to hell, and cannot be equal to anything else.

And just so heaven has enchained the affectionate faith of all men, because, deep down in the human heart, there rests the conviction that a right life extended to the eternal outworking of all its upward strivings *is* heaven. Human nature instinctively claims eternity for itself, and with unflinching consistency identifies the ultimate state of men with their essential moral character. Philosophy responds to this aspiration in the doctrine of Kant, that immortality is a postulate of the moral law, because holiness, the demand of the law, is attainable only as the result of an eternal parabolic approximation.

7. Immortality, since it has been coupled with the doctrine of sin and its punishment, and of rightness and its reward, has been a *powerful reformatory instrument of evolutionary morality.* Sinners have "trembled" before the doctrine of a judgment to come. The idea that they are "lost"; that they are destined to "perish"; that the "wrath of God abideth" on them; and all because of sin, stirs the sleeping conscience to life. And the obvious justice of the judgment moves them to repentance and amendment of conduct. It is the "power of an endless life."

The doctrine of immortality thus proves its adaptation to human nature in manifold ways. Not only is belief in immortality practically universal, but mankind at its best is most dependent on it and makes the most of it—in our ideals; in the sanctity it gives to moral law; in the dignity it lends to manhood; in the reward it proposes for virtue; in the destined punishment of sin; and in its power to subdue the sinner. In all these respects the doctrine is clearly evolutionary, and is a powerful adjunct to the triumph of evolution.

Has the doctrine of immortality lost its power with thoughtful people? Undoubtedly, the teaching of positivist biologists and sociologists, that man is but a higher animal, has had its effect on the *thought* of the time. The high tide of the skeptical philosophy was reached, I judge, in Herbert Spencer's "First Principles," in his doctrine that mind and its functions are correlate with physical forces; and the partial withdrawal from this doctrine in the last edition of that work marks the beginning of the ebb. The "Cosmic Philosophy" of John Fiske, and the clear statement of that popular and revered author's faith—"I believe in the immortality of the soul" ("Destiny of Man," 116), has gone very far toward sending the pendulum of public opinion back in the opposite direction.

Meantime, the proclamation of the old faith in immortality has achieved its victories in the restoration of sinful men, an ever-growing multitude from all races, all classes, and all conditions of men—showing that in its deepest springs human nature has never shared the philosophical doubt.

CHAPTER XVI

The Power Behind Evolution—Two Theories

THE doctrine of immortality, if true, is thus true because it is in the scheme of the Power that has determined evolution from the first. And everything that tends to the progress of humanity does so because it was destined to that end as a part of the evolutionary scheme. Moreover, we have failed to get an adequate conception of evolution in its moral stage till we have conceived of it as the sum total of all the humanizing and civilizing and moralizing influences that can by any means be brought to bear on the human mind or heart or will. The scheme of evolution includes all the possibilities of improvement in man and all possible means of converting those possibilities of improvement into actual progress.

And since man's moral progress is a *self-determined* conformity to the evolutionary

plan, the first step in our self-development must be to obtain an adequate conception of the plan. But this can best be done scientifically, I judge, considering the vast extent and complexity of the phenomena involved and the state of thought relative to the subject-matter, by comparing the two most prominent theories now current relative to the nature of the Power behind evolution, and by testing them as we test all theories, by their responsiveness to the demands of the situation. That is to say, the theory, in this case, that furnishes the best guarantee of human progress is the best theory.

These theories are, first, that which regards the Power behind evolution as an eternally existent *atomic force;* and, secondly, that which conceives of the Power behind evolution as a *personal God.* I will first notice briefly the nature of the two theories.

The theory that the Power behind evolution is an eternally existent *atomic force* does not undertake to explain the nature of this force, which is called atomic because it has its seat in the ultimate atoms of matter. The theory may or may not attempt to account for the

atoms themselves as modes of force. It does not profess to explain the origin of force. Recognizing the doctrine of the persistence of force, it supposes that it never could have had a beginning, and that it never has been, and never will be, less than it now is. And matter, whether it be, or be not, a mode of force, is eternal. If it be a mode of force, then its past and future eternity of existence, in some form or other, is involved in the persistence of force. If the atom be not a mode of force, but a distinct real existence, then as such it always must have been and always will be; and as such it constitutes the material in and through which the eternal cosmic force operates.

In the ultimate atoms thus endowed with an eternal force, or regarded as themselves a mode of force, we have a complete explanation of the universe and of all existing things, including man. The atoms, at first dispersed —uniformly, perhaps—throughout space, were endowed with force in such ways that, by their own spontaneous movement, they produced, first, the integrations of what we call gravitation; then, the conditions being ripe, they gave

rise to the combinations called chemical; later, they developed life; and, lastly, the rational nature of man. As the forces lying dormant in the acorn produce the oak, so the forces sleeping in the ultimate atoms of matter were the potentiality of a completed and inhabited cosmos.

This theory is called *monistic* by Haeckel and his followers, as opposed to the alleged dualism of theists, who regard creation as the handiwork of a deity—a spiritual being existing independently of the ultimate material atoms. The propriety of this designation is not quite obvious, unless in the case of Herbert Spencer, who resolves the material atom into a mode of force—the single, or monistic, principle underlying all things being thus an eternal force. But when *matter and force* are recognized as being distinct and different elements, it is not clear why we may not as well speak of *matter and spirit* as constituting a monistic system. The scientific monist will not pretend that he understands the nature of *force.* Avowedly, he has no knowledge of *spirit.* He is, therefore, in no situation to deny that the marvellously versatile force,

which he locates in the atoms, is one and the same thing with the spirit, of which the theist predicates omnipresence and immanence; or to question that the cognition of material phenomena which, as he avers, gives him a knowledge of force, may every whit as reasonably be said to convey the knowledge of spirit. In other words, the criticism he lays against theism is equally valid against his own doctrine. And, indeed, dualism is a most obvious objection to Haeckel's doctrine.

If by the *theistic theory* were meant simply what the popular mind distinctly contemplates when it declares that *God* made the worlds and man, it would only need to be mentioned in this place. But much more is implied.

First, it is implied that *God is spirit.* I have argued that man is an immortal spirit. But this does not mean that I can understand spirit, even though the spirit I undertake to scrutinize be my own. It means that while I believe the evidence to be overwhelming that I have a spirit, I cannot at all understand it. It means that spirit—even my own spirit—is an inscrutable and unsearchable mystery to me. And much more is God a mystery—a

mystery past finding out—because God is spirit.

Secondly, by the theistic theory it is implied that the ultimate atoms of *matter* are simply divine efficiency responding to divine volition. We have to judge of the action of the Divine Spirit by our knowledge of the action of spirit within us. Now I *will* that my hand move; it moves—I know not how or why, save that I will it, and that, answering to the volition, power somehow manifests itself in the moving of my hand. And just so the Divine Spirit *wills* the peculiar combination of sensible effects we call an atom, and lo! it is done; as in the Hebrew of Genesis it is written, "And God said [willed], Let light be; and light was." And at the same time that God created atoms, he willed the laws governing the movement of atoms, stamping them perhaps on the atoms themselves in the beginning, and straightway the process of evolution began and has proceeded up to the present hour—an expression of Almighty Power responding to the all-wise and unchanging Will.

Thirdly, the theistic theory supposes that,

into the refined organism of the highest and final product of his own volition and efficiency, God somehow—either gradually and in connection with the creative methods already naturalized in the cosmos, or by a new manifestation of self-determining efficiency—breathed an immortal spark in likeness to himself—a rational, self-determined moral spirit—and so created *man*, a son of God.

Fourthly, this theory is consistently *monistic*. It supposes the sum total of force to be eternally unchanged. Matter is a mode of force, which began to be and may cease to be, being resolved from and into other modes of force. The process of evolution—possibly a series of alternating evolutions and dissolutions—proceeds according to the uniform operation of natural laws, which are merely the immutable modes in which the divine efficiency acts. And the force determining and constituting all things is the almighty power of an omnipresent and ever-acting personal God, *in whom* all finite beings live, and move, and are.

Fifthly, the theistic theory conceives of the self-determining power of the human spirit as

a divine self-limitation. If it is difficult to conceive how any being can be infinite and absolute and yet be limited, it is equally difficult to conceive how he can be infinite and absolute if he lack the power of self-limitation. And this divine self-limitation is in no sense to be regarded as an abdication or abatement of sovereign control. For in all the activity of the human spirit God himself is always conceived of as acting, somehow, for the accomplishment of his own eternal and all-wise purposes, even directing the "wrath" and the sins of men to that end.

NOTE.—There is no attempt in this chapter, or in the book, to give an adequate statement of monistic doctrine. Philosophical monism, or a monism based on a theory of knowledge, is aside from the scope of this discussion, which is scientific. My allusions to monism contemplate it primarily as a scientific hypothesis or theory, and secondarily as an implication of Bible doctrine.

CHAPTER XVII

The Two Theories Compared

THESE two theories as to the nature of the noumenal Efficiency underlying cosmic Order and cosmic Progress, having thus been characterized sufficiently for present purposes, I will now consider them relative to their fitness for control in human lives and in human society, and that without attempting to answer objections or to remove difficulties, trusting that if the main point shall be measurably established the difficulties may reasonably be supposed not insuperable.

The specific question is, whether the theory positing an atomic force as the ultimate reality, or that positing the existence of a personal God, is best calculated to marshal the evolutionary forces of mankind to the overthrow of the counter-evolution of sin. Which of the two is best calculated to enlist the self-determined activities of all men in a

forward movement of humanity that shall be a worthy crown and consummation of cosmic evolution? In other words, which theory is most likely to influence men to subject their animal proclivities and reason to the supreme authority of moral law? Or, since most men have not done this, which of the two theories has the better equipment of sanctions and persuasions to induce self-indulgent and sin-debauched men to turn from evil to righteousness?

In answering these questions, I shall recognize, as representatives of the atomic force theory, Ernst Haeckel, as his views are set forth in his "Monism," etc.; and Lester F. Ward, in "Dynamic Sociology." Herbert Spencer is in many respects to be classed with these writers, since to him the creative Power is inscrutable and unknown, save as it is manifested in and through the subrational stages of cosmic evolution. But, although Spencer claims to be agnostic relative to any evidence of self-conscious personality in that Power, he is yet a very cautious atheist, and his writings are characterized by a reverence for the Unknown that withdraws him from that class of

thinkers and prepares us to find in his great admirer and successor, John Fiske, an earnest exponent of theism.

As representing the theistic theory I shall refer to a very old book, which, in whole or in part, has been the basis of theistic instruction in the most progressive portions of the world for from fifteen hundred to twenty-five hundred years; and which, to-day, is loved and believed in by more people than ever before. I mean, of course, the Bible.

And I mean the common man's Bible, which purports to be in the main scientific—that is, to be a statement of *facts* relative to God and his relations and dealings with men. I do not undertake to vouch for these facts. I simply accept them as being representative of the most advanced and most progressive form of theism. Christianity, though very imperfectly representing the teachings of this book, has always been characterized, and is to-day characterized, by an acceptance of the Bible *as it stands*. Criticism may make what it will of the Bible; but criticism has not determined the faith of Christendom to any considerable extent. Nor can it for a long time to come,

if ever. A sufficiently diligent and scholarly student, who has nothing else to do, might keep within sight of the results of criticism; but, if he be also prudent, he will be slow to accept them as the last word of wisdom. But to the many, who are not scholars and who, as a rule, are engrossed in the necessary work of life, criticism is a *terra incognita*, and one very liable to be peopled with dark and monstrous forms. The Bible as it is, is necessarily the common people's manual of theism; and the results of Bible teaching that are to be so general as to constitute a stage of cosmic evolution, will be manifest, if at all, and if the Bible is adapted to produce such results, in the lives of the common people who believe wholly in it as the Word of God, infallible and perfect.

NOTE.—But criticism will naturally serve for the gradual elimination of superstitious and irrational elements from the popular faith, securing for it a secular advance toward ideal truth. Whether or not this means the ultimate total extinction of faith in the Bible, will depend upon whether the Bible is deeply and permanently, or only superficially and transiently, adapted for the supply of the world's need. We shall find light upon this point as we proceed.

1. Compare the two theories as to certain *fundamental conceptions.*

The atomic theory regards *God* as the "sum total of the force of the universe, which is inseparable from the sum total of the matter of the universe." God is not a personal being having intelligence and will; not an all-powerful Spirit transcendent above the universe and ruling over it, as well as immanent within it. He is co-eternal with matter, conditioned by matter, and is properly to be called not "he" but "it," as we designate force, since he is force and nought else. In other words, there is no God, in the sense in which the term is usually employed.

The atomic theory regards *man* as nothing more than a superior animal. He is simply the supreme form of organized matter. Every ultimate atom of matter has two properties, motion and feeling. As the atoms are integrated more and more, the feelings of the atoms are represented, first, by chemical affinity, then by the vital and animal sensibilities, and finally by the human consciousness. "Immaterial forces or immaterial 'spirits' (minds) are unknown to us. As Gœthe once said, 'Mind can never exist and act without matter, matter never without

mind.'" Man has a "soul" in the same sense in which "all matter is ensouled"—that is, as having "feeling."

The atomic theory denies, of course, the *immortality* of the human soul. "The widely disseminated *dogmatic* belief in a *personal* immortality . . . is, *scientifically*, absolutely untenable." The above quotations are from Haeckel, in "The Monist." (Vol. I, pp. 483–485.)

In contrast with these doctrines, theism holds that *God* is an infinite Spirit endowed with all conceivable perfections; that he is an omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient personality, holy, just, and good; and that he is the creator, sustainer, and rightful lord of all things, including matter and man;—that *man*, though physically an animal, is also a rational spirit, and as spirit he is a son of God, owing to God filial homage, love, and service; that, as sharing the nature of Deity, man is *immortal*, and will be determined as to his eternal destiny by the character he establishes here.

The only *proof* that my argument calls for relative to these doctrines, is that which is to be found in their *fitness to promote human*

progress. Which is better, naturalism or theism? Which man is the more likely to be striving upward toward the ideal goal of evolution—the man who believes himself to be merely a superior sort of animal? Or the man who believes himself to be an immortal son of God? And which society is the more likely to be physically, mentally, and morally progressive—a society of the sons of God? Or a society of animals?

Unless I mistake, the idea that man is a mere animal, destined only to be food for worms, is not only the negation of all true dignity in man and of all inspiration to strive after the ideal; is not only the dedication of mankind to unmitigated animalism; but the idea also awakens in average humanity a feeling of shocked repugnance not unmixed with contempt. At all events, *it is not, and never has been, a popular idea.* Men have always aspired to communion with Deity. And this thought has always carried with it the more or less conscious implication that there is something nobler in man than in the beast—something in man's nature qualifying him for such exalted fellowship. And the very

fact that this idea commands the approving consent of mankind, whereas animalism does not, has in itself an important bearing upon the problem of social amelioration.

Most men in these days believe, I suppose, that the improvement of society is to come, if it ever is to come at all, from society itself—from the self-determination of a majority of the people toward better things; from the adoption, by a growing element of the population, of nobler ideals and worthier methods of action. But if this is so, and if, as we have seen, a belief in immortality is, and always has has been, practically universal among men—even a "differential attribute of humanity"—what promise of social amelioration is to be found in the doctrine of naturalism? Even if if we grant all that its advocates claim for it as an evolutionary *theory*, it must infallibly prove in practice to be the deadest of all dead letters. For, *what men do not believe in cannot move them to action—cannot lift them up.*

And is it not also self-evident that a man inclined to sinful indulgence will be far more likely to make his animal nature an excuse for yielding, than to make his divine sonship such

an excuse? Indeed, he will justify himself *because* of his animal nature, but *in spite of* his divine kinship. For the divine in us is that which leads us upward. And it is only as the divine gets control of the animal element in us, that we rise to higher and better things.

2. Compare the two theories as to their deliverances relative to the *condition of humanity* that constitutes the actual starting-point or basis of evolutionary progress.

Naturalism and theism agree that up to a certain point man developed normally. But theism asserts that Adam, or *man*, very early in his distinctively human career—practically at the beginning of it—after having lived for a time in filial communion with God and in obedience to his commands, chose to gratify a physical appetite by an act contrary to the expressed wish and commandment of God, and thereby introduced sin into the world and set in motion those influences, which, as we have seen, produced the counter-evolution, involving all mankind in both the tendency to evil and the actual transgression of evolutionary law. So we read that Adam was "the son

of God;" that "God made man upright;" that "by one man sin entered into the world;" that "sin is the transgression of the law;" that, as a consequence of Adam's sin, "all have sinned."

Theism further alleges that sin is a bondage from which man has within himself, unaided from without, no power of escape. We read, "Whoso committeth sin is the servant of sin." He is "without strength," "without hope." "The good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do." Which agrees with what we have seen as to the effect of sin in this, that by it man *falls behind* the demands of the evolutionary law and plan of human nature, not only in fact, but also in the ability and the disposition to do the right, and even in the knowledge of what is right; insomuch that if he were to turn about and try his best to live the true life, his ignorance, his evil tendencies, and the sluggishness of nature caused by sin, would not only prevent his *catching up* with the evolutionary plan of his life, but it would prevent his holding his relative distance behind the plan. He is always falling farther and farther behind—getting ever

more and more hopelessly in debt to the demands of the law.

Again, theism teaches the doctrine of individual human immortality, and declares that the wicked "shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." And we have a distinct intimation that the future condition of the wicked, though called "punishment," "outer darkness," a "lake of fire," and the like, is simply the natural outcome in eternity of a growing sinfulness—a growing lack of harmony with environment. For we read of certain persons that they have "never forgiveness," but are "guilty of an eternal sin" (Mark iii, 29, Revision).

To all of these doctrines naturalism has no reply whatever save absolute denial. Since, as it proclaims, there is no such thing as human freedom, no spirit in man, no immortality; of course there is no such thing as sin, in the sense of a voluntary violation of law and desert of punishment; and so, in this sense, there is no bondage to sin. And there is no counter-evolution, and no eternal divergence of the individual from harmony with environment; in other words, no eternal punishment

of sin. All these facts, that theism thus characterizes, are simply the misinterpreted marks of an incomplete evolution. Time and the operation of natural laws will eliminate them.

To be sure, evolution means the snuffing out of myriads of human lives, as it means the singeing of the moths that flit about our lights. But that signifies no more in the one case than in the other, for naturalism has no message of hope for the individual. The best of men are bound to be "snuffed out" sooner or later. And that glorious evolution, whose progress in human society we are supposed to admire and to further, is to us individually nothing more than a shrewd scheme for getting comfortably through our three score years and ten, more or less; with an incidental outlook to the possibility that others may do the same.

Which of these doctrines has the most of promise, looking toward the furtherance of social evolution:—that which tells us we are not sinners? Or that which tells us that we are sinners, and that the only hope of progress, for ourselves or for society, is in confessing and forsaking our sins, and in culti-

vating lives conformable to the evolutionary standard?

The answer of the common consciousness of mankind to this question I hardly need to mention. The conviction that we are sinners is universal. The general prevalence of systems of sacrifice in all religions attests the existence of a consciousness of sin in all peoples of all grades of intelligence and culture throughout the world. And to those who believe thus, and especially to those who know the germinal nature of sin and the accelerating degeneration and growing bondage of those who have yielded themselves to its power, the denial that there is such a thing as sin will not only seem to be supreme unreason; but, with reference to the moral evolution of society, it will seem, like the reputed folly of the ostrich, to be a burying of one's head in the sand to escape the pursuit of a mortal foe; or, like the superficial quackery of the medical empiric, to be a plastering of the surface in hope of curing the cancer that is eating out one's vitals.

The only rational hope for the amelioration of social conditions is, not in the denial, but

in the amplest acknowledgment, of the ills that beset us, and in applying adequate remedies.

But in this case, as with reference to atheism, it is true that a doctrine that nobody believes in is not calculated to lift up society. The doctrine that man is not a sinner, if it shall be acceptable to anybody besides the theorizers that promulgate it, will naturally be acceptable chiefly to those who wish to believe it as a cloak and excuse for the sins they choose to commit, rather than to those who are striving to achieve a normal subjection of the animal in us to our moral nature. The tendency of this doctrine, therefore, is not ethical and evolutionary, but precisely the reverse.

3. Consider the two theories as to their deliverances and proposals relative to the *means by which social evolution is to be promoted.*

Social evolution, as viewed in its rational character, being based upon and determined by the intelligent self-determinations of the individuals composing society, the means adapted to promote social evolution will be the means calculated to promote in individuals a vivid conviction of the superior desirability

of the evolutionary life and a resolute determination to pursue it.

In general, naturalism and theism are agreed as to the true *method* of promoting evolutionary desires, decisions and conduct. The great method is *education*—the inculcation of facts. The radical difference between them is in the nature of the facts employed—naturalism denying scientific standing to everything that appertains to the nature of man as a spiritual being. I shall, therefore, find it convenient from this point on to give priority in the discussion to theism, instituting the comparison with the narrower system later. Without undertaking any very formal exposition of the "plan of salvation," for which I lack time and space, I will notice some of the salient points of the scheme somewhat arbitrarily under the three titles following:—first, the Saviour of men; secondly, the Saviour's Message to the world; thirdly, the Saviour's Mission to his followers.

(1) The Saviour of men.

Theism adequately expresses the hopelessness of men by reason of the counter-evolution. It holds that all men are by nature (that

is, by their fallen nature) unwilling to exert themselves for the sake of right living, being partly indifferent as to the advantages which they conceive it offers them, and partly skeptical as to the practicability of attaining them; and, at the same time, that they have no adequate conception, either of the end to be attained or of the means to be employed in attaining it; while, finally, on account of both personal and ancestral transgressions, that they lack physical, mental, and moral ability to live up to the normal standard, even though they were perfectly aware of its requirements. This state of inability the New Testament writers speak of as a "sleep;" or, to emphasize the more impressively the idea, men are said to be the "slaves" of sin, or even to be "*dead* in trespasses and sins." But from this state of moral stagnation and impotence men need to be aroused.

But who is to arouse them if all men are thus holden by the stupor of moral death? The answer is, a man with an uncorrupted will—one whose nature has never suffered the dire catastrophe of moral collapse—a son of God unfallen. And such a one, we are told,

came from God. He is called the First-Begotten of the Father—our Elder Brother; and it is said that "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." We are told that he lived a lowly life of manual toil; then taught a few years, raising up a little group of men and women devoted to the upward life; and then, the germs of a restored humanity having been implanted, he departed, leaving a Message to mankind and a Mission to his followers.

(2) The *Message* of Jesus Christ to mankind is, "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." And it is expressly stated that "Christ Jesus *came into the world to save sinners.*"

I have no wish to disguise the fact that the person and work of the historical Christ bristle with aggressive suggestions that challenge investigation. But my present business is, not to investigate difficulties, but to note *facts.* And among the facts I wish to notice are some of the *claims* set forth in the above statements from the New Testament. And the New

Testament, be it observed, is itself a fact as substantial as a stratum of Medina sandstone.

It is claimed, first, that the one who spoke the above gracious words was not only the "only begotten Son" of God; but he was *God himself*—"God manifest in flesh." In other words, the unsearchable Spirit from whom all things proceed has chosen to take to himself a mode of self-limitation and self-expression that would bring him within reach of the human understanding. And this unsearchable Spirit, self-revealed as the man Jesus Christ, is repeatedly and in manifold ways said to be the Creator and Upholder of all things. And He, the Creator of man, the Power of evolution, as the only possible means of carrying on the world-process in its rational stage, came in person to conquer back to himself the revolted minds and hearts and wills of men.

It is claimed, secondly, that the means by which the loyalty of men to their true nature and destiny is to be won back is the *power of divine love*. Men are not to be compelled to do right. Their rational self-determined nature is to be respected. If they are to be won

at all, it must be because their hearts, their affections, their desires, are won; and because they voluntarily choose the up-grade of the evolutionary life. That they may thus choose, Christ offers them his love. And he tells them that, while in sinning against themselves they have been sinning against him, their creator and rightful lord; if they repent of their sins and turn from them, he will forgive them, and will give them the effectual assistance of his almighty power in their efforts to escape the bondage of sin and to live the true life.

Moreover, it is claimed, that it was in order to convince mankind of the reality and the intensity of his love for them, that Christ lived for three years in lowly labor, identifying himself in every possible way with the humblest of men, sympathizing with them in sorrow and in joy, healing their sicknesses, feeding the hungry, raising the dead, and teaching them of God's love and desire to save them from their sins. And he told them plainly that he came to them, not as a prophet, but as the Son, the Only-Begotten, of the Father, with the power and the authority of God at his disposal; that he could forgive their sins; and

that he came into the world for no other purpose but to save them to the true life. And he declared that it is as great a source of happiness to God to save a sinning creature as it is to the creature to be saved. He tells us that "there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance." And he himself exclaims, "Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost."

It is claimed, thirdly, that God will always be present with those who, by repentance for sin and by accepting Christ as their Lord and Saviour, are endeavoring to live the true life; and will strengthen and help them in the upward course, which in its beginnings is unnatural and difficult. The true evolutionary life is the life of communion with God; and it is at the same time a life of the easiest, most glorious, and most varied and untiring activity. But in the transition from counter-evolution to evolution—from sin to rightness—there is a stage of difficulty, in which the pursuit of the right life is a matter of painful assiduity; a struggle, in which men need to exert every

power they possess and to "pray without ceasing" for overcoming strength. And we are taught that such prayers will be heard, and that the power of God will move to the rescue, oftentimes even before the petition has been voiced.

Scientists have sometimes called in question the doctrine that God will interfere with the order of nature in behalf of men, or in answer to prayer. Certainly he will not. But when, a few years since, famine laid her gaunt hand upon India, a prayer for help went forth to Europe and America, and a tide of voluntary benefaction bore back Humanity's answer. No shock of jarring worlds attested the subversion of nature's laws. And, indeed, the laws of nature were not violated. It is a law of nature, that the later orders of control dominate the earlier orders and employ them in subserviency to their own later and higher methods and with a view to the compassing of their own later and higher ends. The subrational laws of nature are thus simply the *implements with which the rational will of man carves out the achieving of its purpose.* "And shall not God hear his own elect who cry day

and night unto him? I tell you he will answer them speedily." The prerogative of that Power from which all things proceed is presumably not inferior to that of the creature; and we do not need to suppose the representations of Holy Writ to be unscientific, but we may rather conceive them to be of the very essence of science, when they declare that a Sovereign Will presides over the world-process—a Will that is both Intelligence and Sympathy; a Will that is not only attent to the appeal of the rational creature, but is also rationally responsive; and that is most surely and always predetermined to overrule all the order and laws of nature in furtherance of that life of holy endeavor which constitutes the final stage and supreme end of cosmic evolution.

(3) The *Mission* of Jesus Christ to his followers, given as he was about to leave them and therefore having the solemn impressiveness of last words, was:—"All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. *Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations,* baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatso-

ever I commanded you : and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

These words the followers of Christ in all ages have recognized as their letters patent, setting forth the fundamental character and paramount purpose of Christianity. With shame and humiliation Christians must recognize their unfaithfulness to this their mission from almost the earliest times to the present day. But, whether faithful or unfaithful, they acknowledge in these words their "Great Commission," signed and sealed by God himself—the document that *ought* to rule the thoughts, feelings, and actions of every Christian. As to what is involved in this charter, we observe :—

First, it asserts that Jesus Christ has the dominion and, for all relevant practical purposes, the omnipresence of the Power behind evolution. "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. . . . And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

Secondly, it imposes upon all the followers of Christ the same supreme purpose that brought him into the world, namely, to de-

liver mankind from the counter-evolution of sin, and to win them to the evolutionary life. Another version of the "Commission" makes this even plainer:—"Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be condemned." "Discipleship" and "believing" are terms that imply no mere identification with an arbitrary system of dogmas and ceremonial observances; it is accepting Christ as Saviour and Lord, and the consequent doing of "all things that he commanded" men to do; which means "perfection," or a life in every respect conformable to the evolutionary scheme; or, in the language of Christ, "as my Father, which is in heaven, is perfect."

This work of teaching and making disciples has the true evolutionary stamp, in that, while it began "at Jerusalem," with a mysteriously un-Jewish spirit, it was directed forth to "all nations." And the promise is that it shall be gloriously triumphant:—"The kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High,

whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him."

We have seen that the coöperation of rational beings implies a certain degree of *organization* — constitution, officers, meetings, etc.; and we accordingly notice that,

Thirdly, the earliest followers of Christ, in carrying out the orders of their Master to "disciple" the nations, *organized* themselves into "assemblies" or "churches." Whenever converts were made, they were initiated into the "assembly," as Christ had commanded, by baptism—this rite signifying that the candidate had experienced—or had achieved—a change from the life of moral degeneration into which he was born, by virtue of his connection with a sinning race, and had entered upon the life of evolutionary endeavor—a change definitely contemplated as being as radical as though he had died and been buried, and had been "born anew" into another and different existence. The disciples were instructed to meet together for various purposes; and they were accustomed to meet on the first day of the week to listen to instruction in the Scriptures, and in all that ap-

pertains to the new life, and to commemorate the Lord's death in the "Lord's Supper," which was also intended to signify that the evolutionary life is to be maintained only by constantly partaking of the symbolic "flesh" and "blood"—the spiritual life—of the God-man.

Those early disciples accepted the Jewish Scriptures and the writings of the apostles (when available), as the inspired Word of God, the authoritative "*constitution*" of their churches. The churches had their most devoted and most competent members set apart as "overseers" (bishops) or "elders," answering to pastors or teachers; and others, called "deacons," to attend to financial and other temporal affairs. These churches raised funds, and sent out and maintained missionaries to the remotest limits of the known world; thus fulfilling, not merely in their local communities, but in the largest sense, the mission imposed upon them by their Lord's words—a mission imposed also, as we are hearing nowadays, though probably not many of them realized the fact, by our common humanity.

Fourthly, Christ distinctly enunciates a doc-

trine of the *moral evolution of society* through the united voluntary efforts of his followers. The "children of the kingdom" are "good seed." As they multiply, they become in their total number a single growing "body," of which each several disciple is a "member," and the "head" is Christ. This body, it is predicted, will continue to grow till, as the kingdom of God, it fills the earth, triumphing over all opposition.

Such is the scheme of theism for the promotion of social evolution. *What has naturalism to offer* for this end? And how do the two schemes compare?

The most advanced and practical proposition of naturalism, so far as I know, is that of Auguste Comte in his "Philosophie Positive" and of Lester F. Ward in his "Dynamic Sociology." This is *universal education in the sciences.* Comte would have society, which has passsd through its theological stage of credulity, and is now (or was in his time, fifty years ago) in the metaphysical stage of skepticism, reconstructed along the lines of positive truth enunciated by science. The sciences

should be popularized and universally inculcated in the order of their interdependence—the simpler and more general coming first. The due order is as follows: Mathematics, Astronomy, Physics, Chemistry, Biology (vegetable and animal, and including Psychology), and Sociology. Comte recognizes the religious instinct in man, and provides for it by what he calls the Religion of Humanity. But he recognizes no subversion of rational control by sin.

Ward's doctrine, in its essential characteristics, is not substantially different from that of Comte. Premising that man has no soul capable of subsisting independently of the body; that man is, therefore, not immortal; and that there is no God:—Ward's doctrine is, that the individual and social organism of man should be molded to its highest attainable perfection, physical, intellectual, and moral, by a universal system of education.

This doctrine is unquestionably good as far as it goes. The only criticism that my present purpose calls for is, that it fails absolutely and *in toto* to meet the exigencies of moral evolution. The denial of immortality, remanding man to hopeless animalism, removes all really

powerful motives to exertion; and exertion is of the essence of all evolutionary morality. There is the assumption that mankind in general are evolving, morally as well as physically and intellectually, by the slow "genetic" process; and the denial of the fact of moral counter-evolution, with its demand for a reversal of the ruling moral purpose of men; and a denial of the remedial influence of Christianity, or of the necessity for any remedial influence whatever apart from the teaching of an aggressively atheistical system of education.

Indeed, I find in naturalism no adequate conception of the nature and methods of the rational stage of cosmic evolution. The power of rational self-determination, while implied in general in the system, is practically denied with reference to man's ability voluntarily to subject his intellect to his animal nature so as to forfeit its evolutionary power and so as to bring himself into bondage to evil tendencies. And accordingly it fails to recognize man's need of moral regeneration, not to mention his dependence on help from above in order to obtain it.

CHAPTER XVIII

The Practical Test of the Two Theories

BUT the success or failure of a doctrine is determined, not by its apparent logical perfection or logical deficiencies, but by its *fruits in practical life.* And I undertake to say that naturalism, as judged by this test, is a total failure as compared with Christianity; and that Christianity makes good its claims by the practical power displayed by it in the moral regeneration of society.

1. Theism makes a definite coherent attempt to counteract the evil of the counter-evolution, and to establish the moral evolution of society on a distinctively rational basis.

While, during the nearly two thousand years of its history, the church has made some poor work—some sad departures from its calling—it is to-day waking up to its delinquencies and returning to the performance of

its duty with something of the primitive consistency and directness.

During the last one hundred years the duty of laboring to secure the adoption of the right life by "every creature," has risen to dominate the activities of all those peoples who recognize the Bible as an evolutionary book. To begin with, the *Bible has been translated* into hundreds of different languages and dialects—made practically available for the whole world. Its lofty ethics, which Herbert Spencer, by a curious perversity of human nature, declares to be "too high," have been brought to the attention of all peoples.

In America and Great Britain the *churches have organized* themselves thoroughly for evangelistic work. The idea that the church is responsible for securing the conversion of the entire population of the world to the upward life, is becoming a more impressive reality year by year in the minds and consciences of a great multitude of people. The whole equipment and the public sentiment of the churches are being gradually turned to this one purpose —the worldliness and self-indulgence of many who profess Christianity, being the great

obstacle to its progress. It is interesting and instructive to note how, within the last fifty years, every class of church members have organized themselves into coöperative efficiency.

Aside from the weekly preaching service, the Sunday School, and the mid-week social meeting for the study of Bible truth and Christian duty by the total membership of the church, the *women* have organized various interests, including temperance and home and foreign missions, the women's foreign missionary societies being especially designed to send women missionaries to the secluded women of oriental countries. The *young people* have organized for Christian work in the Christian Endeavor Societies of various names. *Young men* have their Christian Associations, with railroad and college branches. Christian travelling men have their Gideon's Band. *Young women* have parallel organizations of their own in every department. The *girls* have their "What I Can" societies, and there are children's, and even baby bands, in which devoted women train the little ones to love Christ and to serve him. The entire membership of the churches are somehow en-

listed, or are trying to get enlisted, in some special line of work whereby they may make the best use of the powers and opportunities they have for raising humanity to a higher and holier life.

For carrying on the work among the less enlightened peoples, there are separate *home and foreign missionary societies*—the "home missionary" society attending, as a rule, to work within the boundaries of the country in which it is organized; though in the United States their labors are commonly extended to Mexico and other North American countries. The "foreign" societies, on the other hand, send Bibles and missionaries to every land under the sun except Thibet and a few minor countries. These societies are my no means moribund. They are intensely alive. They are growing into the hearts and consciences of their constituents, as is shown by the rising tide of their contributions both of men and of money. It is reported that last year (1901) upward of sixteen millions of dollars were contributed by one hundred missionary societies in Europe and America for this work.

A striking recent feature in missionary en-

terprise is the inauguration of the Student Volunteer movement, which aims at cultivating an interest in missions among students in colleges; at introducing the study of missions into college curricula; and at inducing Christian young men and women in the colleges to devote their lives to missionary work. According to the last annual report (1902), one thousand nine hundred and fifty-three missionaries have been sent out, apparently through the influence of this movement, within the last sixteen years. And the number is steadily increasing.

The college foreign missionary society is also a recent development, in which the Christian students of a particular college, with the coöperation of the alumni of that college, send forth and sustain missionaries. Harvard College is reported to have such a society especially for work among the students of the great cities in India; Yale a similar society for work in China. The independent, or self-supporting, missionary, also, has recently risen to the dignity of a distinct agency in foreign missions.

2. The *results of missionary effort*—the

fruits that constitute the justification of the missionary movement—I cannot attempt to indicate save by some striking figures and illustrative examples. Scientists often seem to take pleasure in denying the possibility of civilizing and Christianizing savages. But of course the question whether such expressions of opinion are scientific or not will depend upon the facts. And, while there are all sorts of facts relevant to the question, as there are all sorts of missions and all sorts of principles upon which they are conducted; yet it is not science to pitch upon the facts that tend to the disparagement of missions, numerous as they may undoubtedly be, and to base one's judgment exclusively upon them, dismissing from consideration those other facts that count for the success of missions. If I remember correctly, it was a very limited number of facts that at first compelled the geologists to change the name of a particular rock formation from "azoic" to "eozoic"; and, by an exact parity of reasoning, it ought not to require very many instances of the civilization and Christianizing of a savage tribe to establish the *possibility* of civilizing and Christian-

izing savages. But the instances are more than a few, and they are rapidly increasing in number.

The *Fiji Islanders* have passed into a synonym for wild ferocity and cannibalism; but since the introduction of Christianity by Wesleyan missionaries, in 1835, the majority of them have become Christianized and civilized. In 1896 their imports were $1,178,500 and their exports $2,105,700, and "the islands are rapidly rising in commercial prosperity."

The *Sandwich Islanders*, also, from gross cannibalism and idolatry, have been transformed, since the arrival of the missionaries in 1820, into orderly and intelligent Christian communities.

As a result of the mission to the *Telugu outcastes*, a new civilization is rising among them, which, by its industry and aggressiveness, bids fair soon to surpass the native Hindoo civilization in physical and intellectual as well as moral attributes. There are now said to be, in all India, not far from two million five hundred thousand Christians, mostly from the lower castes, many of whom become lawyers, doctors, teachers, and preachers; and, as a

result of this development of the lower castes, the higher castes are losing their intellectual superiority and self-conceit, the exclusiveness of caste is giving way, and the higher castes are beginning to be influenced by Christian teaching.

The story of *Uganda* is fresh in every mind. Eighteen years ago the first convert to Christianity was baptized. Now there are thirty thousand baptized Christians in Uganda.

Recently in *Toro*, a country west of Uganda and east of the Congo Free State, a remarkable change has taken place. In 1890 Stanley wrote ("In Darkest Africa," 2, 314), "The ferocity and number of the Wara Sura and the treacherous character of the Wanyoro make it very certain that only a powerful force can ever be able to pass through Toro." But in 1894 a native of Toro, on a visit to Uganda, was converted. Returning to his own land, he called the attention of the king of Toro to the gospel. As a result, the king in 1896 embraced Christianity. Native teachers were sought from Uganda, and some were sent. The king and many of his people learned to read, and Bibles were eagerly sought for. Now, after five years, there are twelve church

buildings, sixty-seven native teachers, and one hundred communicants. The country is entirely safe for peaceable foreigners. In 1897, the king wrote a letter to "The Elders of the Church in Europe," in part as follows :—"God our Father gave me the kingdom of Toro to reign over for Him : therefore I write to you my brethren to beseech you to remember me and to pray for me every day, all the days. . . . I want very much to arrange all the matters of this country for Him only, that all my people may understand that Jesus Christ, he is the Saviour of all countries, and that he is the King of all kings. . . . I want my country to be a strong lantern that is not put out, in this land of darkness."

In 1866 the *Garos* were the "fiercest of the hill tribes of Assam," accustomed to make "annual raids into the plains for human heads of British subjects to pacify the Evil Spirit and secure good crops." The Governor warned the missionary against going to them, saying that the government was considering the necessity of exterminating them as "a bloodthirsty set of savages." But the missionary went, as missionaries have so often gone

in these latter days, with his life in his hands and refusing all military escort. The result:— In 1899, after thirty-three years of labor, a convocation of nearly *eight hundred delegates from Christian churches among the Garos* met to counsel together under their own pastors and teachers, the American missionary being present merely as an honored guest. Among other resolutions adopted, was one undertaking the sending of a Christian missionary to a neighboring tribe.

On a first missionary tour among the *Mikirs*, another hill tribe of Assam, as the missionary's wife was telling the gospel to a crowd of women, "All at once a woman burst out, 'Oh! is it for *me?* Is salvation for *women?* And we never heard of it before! Call the priests together and tell them there is a way to be saved! Call the rulers and let them understand it! Let me go and tell it!' And suiting her actions to her words she started out, telling of a salvation *even for a woman.*"

In *Burma*, where Judson labored and suffered for seven years before obtaining a convert, there are to-day about forty thousand Christians.

Among the *Karens,* also a Burman people, there was a traditional prophecy that some day a white man would come to them with a book to tell them how to live. The white man came with the Bible, and now, out of a total population of 1,000,000, there are not far from 100,000 Christians.

As was to be expected, the stronger nations, as the Chinese and the Japanese, have responded but slowly to the gospel. Long years of preaching and translating Christian literature have been spent. But at last the walls of the Buddhist and Confucian systems begin to show signs of crumbling; and for the last year in Japan, and since the Boxer uprising in China, a remarkable movement toward Christianity has been taking place. There are now reported to be two hundred and fifty thousand Christians in China, and the rate of increase is such as to double the number in ten years—a rate that has held for the last quarter century.

Where savagery prevails, the missionaries are obliged to reduce the spoken language to writing, as preliminary to giving them the Bible and a Christian literature. And every-

where schools, and in due time colleges, follow the preaching of the way of salvation. Christianity is made to the heathen to mean, not a mere system of opinions or religious observances, but a life saved from sin to cleanliness, purity, truthfulness, industry, and unselfishness; and always, when it is thus preached, it works a transformation of individual and home life and of society. I will close this catalogue with some incidents from the last Christmas celebration at the mission to the Kiowa Indians of Saddle Mountain, U. S. A.

Lucius, a Christian Indian, conducted the morning service and said in part, "I am thankful to Jesus to-day because when there were no Christians over here Jesus sent us the missionaries to tell us the gospel; and we have learned that the great Father loves us and sent his only Son to die for us and save us, and we know that this is his birthday. How much I am thankful to-day because I feel it myself that Jesus loves us. When the great Father sent his Son to this earth he didn't come for anything else but to look for poor sinners and the poor Indians. How much different we are to-day. We are new men and

new women and got a new life altogether. . . . May God bless you, poor sinner, and the Holy Spirit lead you into Jesus' own road. If you give your hearts to Jesus to-day, you will make his heart glad on his birthday."

In the same meeting an unconverted Indian said: "I am honestly studying in my heart. . . . I used to eat mescal, gamble, and drink whiskey, but all these things I have cut off; but I still love the Ghost Dance. When you pray, don't forget me; and I want you to ask the Society to pray that I may find Jesus' road soon."

At this meeting these Indians gave $52.10 in cash for a "Jesus house"; and $17.45 to send a "Jesus woman" to another tribe, where a mission has since been established.

The above facts are taken from missionary statistics or from the letters of missionaries having immediate knowledge of the subject-matter. I have chosen to give such facts, rather than bare statistics, because they show more clearly the nature of the work that is being done. They prove that the Bible—a book whose burden is deliverance from sin by the love and power of Christ—is being pro-

claimed among all the peoples of the earth—to rich and poor, to strong and weak, to learned and ignorant—and, best of all, it is triumphing. Triumphing, not suddenly and overwhelmingly as yet, but in strict accordance with the laws of the human mind—at first slowly and with difficulty, but with constantly increasing power and momentum. The churches, which for many centuries forgot their mission, are now going forth to fulfil it, not at all consistently, but yet, in the case of many, with a perseverance and power begotten of the conviction that they are sent of God, and that his almighty power is in their words and works. At first, the heathen who had thought enough to form an opinion laughed at the idea that their religion would one day be supplanted by Christianity; but the steady advance of the tide of Christian effort and achievement, rising year after year, generation after generation, has convinced many of the more intelligent of them that the power of a cosmic movement is behind it, and that the star of Buddha and Confucius must set before the rising of the Sun of Righteousness.

Here then we have a definite, coherent

movement of vast and rapidly growing proportions for the moral regeneration of the world—a movement of a rational nature; that is, a movement of men voluntarily coöperating in the promotion of an interest common to them, rationally apprehended and believed in by them, and promoted, not by force, but by means appealing to and convincing the reason of men. It is a movement, therefore, exactly appropriate to the maturity of humanity. It is a movement, moreover, that is cosmic in character in its adaptation to the needs of all sorts and conditions of people; and it has approved itself as such by its great and growing success the world around. And its success is the uplifting of humanity always and infallibly and in all respects, physically and intellectually as well as morally. Schools and colleges and industries of all sorts are the immediate fruits of the new life it gives to men.

There are, however, two classes of facts that should be noted in order to reach a thoroughly just view of the work of modern missions:—

First, a considerable proportion of the one

hundred missionary societies actively engaged in work at the present time represent constituencies who either do not regard a fundamental change in the character of the self-determination of the individual to be essential to salvation from sin, or who believe that such a fundamental change in the will is to be effected somehow by the mysterious efficacy of ecclesiastical rites and observances. It is evident that the results of missionary labor will differ according to such radical differences in the workers and the work. And, since there is a large element of the workers who do not aim at a reversal in the ruling purpose of the life as the immediate and primary end of endeavor; since there are many who cultivate outward forms and observances in the hope that the change in the ruling purpose will follow; and since as a matter of fact it generally does not follow, as witness Roman Catholic civilizations; it results that there is a discordant and inefficient element in missions, and one that furnishes some ground for the opinion that missions are a failure, in that they fail to work a transformation in the life of the heathen. But that opinion is false and

unscientific, because it fails to take account of *all* the facts. The truth is, that in spite of all inconsistencies and drawbacks, the nineteenth century witnessed no more magnificent victory anywhere than that achieved by Christian missions.

Secondly, scientific men are undoubtedly correct in asserting that no people can be civilized and Christianized in one generation or in two generations. It takes many generations to transform thoroughly the thoughts and feelings, tastes and impulses, natural proclivities and desires, in short, the spiritual life, of a *people*. And when the missionaries are said to have achieved great victories for their faith and to have wrought great transformations among heathen peoples, it is meant, not at all that the heathen, as peoples, have been raised to any near approximation to the stage of civilization that we ourselves have reached. It is meant, rather, that, *when we take into account* the vast change involved in the transition from heathenism to civilization, the missionaries have made a great, a wonderful beginning. And when we reflect upon the defective state of our own civilization after

more than a thousand years of training and culture, the achievements of the missionaries among savage and uncivilized peoples assume almost the character of the miraculous. The rapidly accelerating movement of the cosmic process, however, furnishes an explanation of the phenomenal results of a century of missions. But it lays upon the men of the twentieth century a burden of responsibility that would be appalling if it were not coupled with an equally accumulating wealth of assurance that the results will be commensurate with the responsibility.

Such, in brief, is the scheme, and such are some of the practical results of the scheme, that theism has proposed and carried into effect for compassing the triumph of evolution in its rational stage. Has naturalism anything of the sort to offer? Any scheme that gives promise of achieving in some distant future a universal reign of righteousness among men?

Not the first beginning or suggestion of it. And it is not possible that it ever should have. Those people who believe there is no God, no immortality for man, no human soul, are as a

rule not very powerfully impelled to self-sacrificing labors for the ethical improvement of their less favored fellows. Far more often have they put themselves on record as convinced that such labors are a waste of valuable time, and that the heathen cannot be civilized. But more fatal yet to the pretensions of naturalism to being an evolutionary doctrine, is the fact, already noted, that its adherents are an infinitesimal few, as they always have been. And there is not the shadow of a likelihood that they will ever be anything else.

But, for the creation and maintenance of a rational movement of humanity that shall rise to the dignity of a *stage of cosmic evolution*, there is needed a doctrine adapted to the needs of universal humanity, a doctrine that when duly promulgated will commend itself to all races, all classes, and all conditions of men, as the doctrine of Christianity has done.

And the doctrine that shall guide humanity on the upward course of an ethical evolution, must also be a doctrine to which the unperverted rational nature of man—the nature that

lies deeper in us than all our actually thought opinions and reasoning—must instinctively respond with approval in spite of all the perversions wrought in us by sin. It must be a doctrine that will command our deepest approval though it tear away every mask of sinful self-indulgence and brand us as sinners and as reprobates to the fundamental law of our being —nay, *because* it thus condemns us.

Naturalism is not such a doctrine. By its own essential nature, in the denial of immortality, it awakens a deeper repugnance of mankind to itself than it ever even undertakes to arouse against sin ; and on this account alone there is not the slightest likelihood that naturalism will ever be able to make so much as a respectable *attempt* at the moral control of society.

Nor can naturalism establish its title to the one solitary valuable recommendation in its whole doctrinal scheme. The universal scientific education, which it proposes as the means of social progress, is nothing new—nothing that the naturalistic philosophy has originated. Long before the naturalistic philosophy had received its modern form and expression, such

education was already one of the powerful instruments of theism; and, in its normal subjection to morality, it has already, within the last five decades, gone round the world as handmaid to Christianity to lift up the peoples sitting in darkness.

CHAPTER XIX

CHRISTIANITY SCIENTIFIC

THEISM is a scientific system in all that is essential to it. And by theism, in this connection, I mean Christianity; and Christianity as it is represented by the doctrines and precepts of the Bible, rather than as it is embodied in a historical church that has grown up under the operation of an assumed prerogative of authoritative ecclesiastical interpretation and modification of Scripture. Christianity, as thus conceived, is a scientific system. This may be shown by proving that it is truly evolutionary in its nature and tendencies, as was done in a general way in the last chapter. Now I wish to bring out this truth more particularly and in detail, showing that in its internal character and in its relations to evolution as a whole Christianity is scientific. I will merely illustrate this truth in some conspicuous and representative particulars.

In speaking of Christianity as scientific *in its internal character*, or in its essential nature, regard is had to the nature of Christianity as a practical system, or system of ethical control. The primary aim of a system determines its real nature; and the primary aim of Christianity is not philosophical, or theological, or historical, or archæological, or geological, or astronomical, but *practical*. Christianity has, no doubt, a philosophy, a theology, a history, etc.; but Jesus Christ came into the world to *save sinners*, and he sent his followers forth to preach salvation from sin in his name. That was his mission. It is their mission. The primary aim and character of Christianity, thus, is ethical. And in that character Christianity is the crown and cap-sheaf of evolution. It belongs in the evolutionary scheme as appropriately and naturally in the last place as gravitation belongs at the beginning.

In speaking of Christianity as it is represented by the doctrines and precepts of the Bible, I do not mean to indicate any specific church or religious organization, but rather an ideal church organization, which has no adequate actual embodiment, but which has many

more or less imperfect representations in the various sects of Christendom. In particular, I would guard against the error of Comte and Spencer and many other sociologists, who, because Roman Catholicism has been the leading representative of Christianity for the major part of its history, identify the two; and, when ostensibly discussing Christianity, are really discussing the Roman Catholic Church. But neither do I identify any particular Protestant sect or sects with Christianity. Nor do I exclude either Catholic or Protestant; but I conceive of Christianity as it is set forth as a practical system in the Bible; and of the modern doctrine, practice, and organization of religious bodies as Christian in so far, and only in so far, as they correspond to the teachings of the Bible.

1. Christianity, as thus defined as a practical system based upon the Bible, is scientific in that it *satisfies the conditions of knowledge.* Science is knowledge, and that which satisfies the conditions of knowledge is so far scientific.

Herbert Spencer, in his "First Principles," has indicated the current philosophical doc-

trine of knowledge. This doctrine, so far as it may be necessary for present purposes, is as follows: Our knowledge of sensible objects is not an apprehension of ultimate realities, or of things as they are in themselves; but only of phenomena, or of the appearances they present to our minds. These appearances, however, may represent some objective reality, or they may not—they may be mere appearances, or illusions. We judge of their reality by their *persistence in consciousness.* If after a length of time and after applying a variety of tests the appearance remains, we pronounce it to be representative of reality, and we say we have a knowledge of that reality.

If I see what seems to me to be a chair, my long experience of such appearances leads me at once without reflection to say it is a chair. And if any one were to ask me if I know what it is, I would say, Yes, I know it is a chair. But as a matter of fact I do not *know.* I only know it *appears* to be a chair. But I handle it; it resists. I sit down; it supports me. And then I regard myself as justified in saying emphatically that I *know* it is a chair.

I know it is a chair because the appearance persists under varying tests. But people have been mistaken as to the reality of such appearances, for example, on the first of April.

Again, I see a stick standing obliquely in the water. It looks bent. My experience and my knowledge of the laws of optics tell me the appearance is deceptive. I think the stick is straight. But someone asks me with an insinuating emphasis, Are you *sure* yonder stick is straight? Do you know the appearance is *altogether* deceptive? I immediately weaken. No, I am not sure. I do not know. I pull the stick out of the water to see if there be not at least a slight bend where there seemed to be a very decided one. I test the bent appearance of the stick originally by antecedent experiences on other occasions, and I conclude it is straight. But I test the bent appearance later by a new experience; and then, if the bent appearance still persists under the new test, I say I have reached a *knowledge* that the stick is bent.

In just this way we come to our knowledge of all reality. There is an appearance of some sort, to eye, ear, or other sense; and through

the senses to the mind. And the testing of such appearances by each other gives us in due time what we call knowledge; and not only the knowledge of material and visible objects, but also the knowledge of things we never have seen and never can see, as the air we breathe, or the ether whose vibrations constitute light. If the phenomena presenting themselves are tested only indifferently, and if their persistence in consciousness is only indifferently assured, but sufficiently for ordinary practical purposes, the knowledge would be called common knowledge. But, if the testing is made very severe and the persistence of the phenomena in consciousness is thoroughly attested, then the knowledge is called scientific or philosophical. The knowledge we have of the air and the ether is scientific knowledge. Science accepts these as realities —says we *know* them—because all available phenomena agree together permanently, so far as our experience has gone, to show that they are realities. It is the *persisting and comprehensive harmony of phenomena*, and nothing else whatever, that produces the conviction or knowledge we call scientific.

Now Herbert Spencer has proposed evolution as the reality in which all the phenomena of existence persistently cohere, just as a certain class of phenomena persistently cohere to establish the reality of atmospheric air; and another class persistently cohere to establish the existence of the ether. He regards it as accounting for the phenomena of life, mind, morality, and society, as well as for the simpler phenomena of physics and chemistry. And the persisting coherence of all phenomena, as it is set forth in the doctrine of evolution, produces the appeal to our consciousness—the conviction, or knowledge, that we call by preëminence philosophical—a completely unified knowledge.

In this general position Mr. Spencer is undoubtedly right, and he has conferred a vast benefit on mankind by establishing the doctrine of evolution on a thoroughly scientific basis. But when we come to the classification of our knowledge, I must think that Mr. Spencer has made a mistake, and one that involves him in a misinterpretation of one of the largest and most important of the grand divisions of cosmic phenomena. It is to be noted that classi-

fication is merely a recognition of the groupings into which phenomena naturally fall, and of the relations naturally existing between phenomena and groups of phenomena. In other words, it is a recognition of phenomena and of the persistent coherences of phenomena. And, if a particular collocation of phenomena having a distinctive character of their own shall singly persist, and in their collective coherence shall persist, as obstinately and as permanently as the phenomena of gravitation persist and cohere; then there is no reason in nature or in philosophy why one of these two equally persistent coherences should be recognized in preference to the other, or explained in terms of the other. Persistent phenomena are the *facts* out of which science is made. And there is no going behind the facts.

So I must think that Mr. Spencer has made a mistake in supposing we have reached a truly scientific knowledge of the ethical phenomena usually designated as religious, when we have interpreted them in terms of biological theory. Such interpretation does not reach one half the facts, and it goes counter to some of the deepest and most universal and most

persistent convictions of the human consciousness.

Take, for example, such doctrines as the personality of God, God's providential oversight and watchcare of mankind, the objectivity of the answer to prayer, the reality of sin, the necessity of propitiation, the immortality of the soul; and combine them with doctrines characteristic of Christianity, such as the historical self-revelation of Deity in the person of Jesus Christ, the inspiration of the Scriptures, the love of God for man, the vicarious atonement, the resurrection of the dead, the judgment, heaven and hell—which doctrines all together form a coherent system, that is not only as a whole persistent in the convictions of a vast multitude of people of all sorts and conditions, but is also the most vigorous, most vitally active, most aggressive, and most triumphantly progressive ethical system in existence—the only system that has a definite and practical evolutionary outlook. But the biological interpretation either discards *in toto* or virtually eviscerates every one of these doctrines.

The truth is, that the doctrine of evolution

which regards biological theory as an adequate explanation of the phenomena of human life and of society *does not fit the facts.* The laws of growth, of habit, of inheritance, of the relations of organism and function to one another, and the reciprocal relations of both with environment—biological laws—are no more competent to account for these phenomena than an application of chemical or of physical principles would be. A *new* principle is needed to establish a comprehensive and persistent harmony of ethical phenomena. Precisely as, at a certain stage of evolution, gravitation ceased to harmonize the phenomena, and a new principle —chemical affinity—must be superadded ; and just as, later, still another new principle, namely, life, must be added to harmonize a new and higher class of phenomena ; so, still later, when man appears upon the scene, yet a fourth principle must be introduced to harmonize rational and moral phenomena. This last principle, of course, is rational will. And rational will, in conjunction with the other principles, constitutes evolution a complete interpretation of all existing phenomena.

It is because Christianity furnishes a persis-

tent and comprehensive harmony of ethical phenomena—because it appeals persistently to human nature and the human consciousness at many points—that it is a powerful, progressive, and conquering system. And the fact that it does furnish such a persisting harmony of phenomena, means that we *know* its doctrines are true, precisely as we know the atomic constitution of matter, the undulatory nature of light, the existence of ether, the nebular origin of the universe. And this is scientific knowledge.

Nay, religious knowledge is far more scientific—is more comprehensive, touching the human consciousness at more points; and is more intimately coherent—and is far less likely to be subverted by new discoveries, than that which we are wont to term scientific. The physical sciences owe their fundamental conceptions to the genius of a few eminent investigators, who alone have the knowledge and ability to test them. Some other investigator a little more learned and a little more skilful may put them all to confusion. Who knows, for example, what may come of some variation of the vortex theory of atoms?

But the phenomena underlying the doctrines of Christianity are largely within, or at least are easily accessible to, the consciousness of every man; and especially accessible to the consciousness of every man who has fulfilled the prescribed and normal conditions of such knowledge. Every man who has from his heart renounced the dominion of his lower nature and adopted the life of strenuous endeavor after that which is above, and who has come into true relations with the Power of the evolutionary life, has within his own mind and heart a touchstone of religious truth. His own conscious needs and aptitudes will recognize their object when they find it; and he will know, beyond the power of any or all scientists to gainsay, whether religion has a reality or not; whether the benign words that purport to have come from the lips of the Son of God have in them a divine blessing or not.

Thus, in the persistency and the coherence of the facts that are universal in the human consciousness and in the persistency and the coherence of those additional facts that are universal in the Christian consciousness, we have a knowledge entirely analogous in char-

acter to that which all men have of the phenomena that constitute our material environment and which lie at the basis of the physical sciences; while of the fundamental verities of Christian ethics—God, freedom, sin, regeneration, immortality, heaven, hell—the persisting and coherent adaptations to human nature that constitute knowledge are as much more generally within the reach of human intelligence than are the fundamental verities of the physical sciences as the foundation of the pyramid is broader than its apex.

And this is but natural. We ought to have anticipated as much. For, the further evolution advances, the more nearly it approximates to the eternal verities; and in the rational nature of man we have a traceable kinship to that from which all things proceed; while the analogies of mind to matter are so remote that it need not be surprising if only the supreme developments of human genius and culture should avail to give man an insight into them and to reveal the deep mysteries of the physical universe.

2. Christianity is scientific in its *aim*, which is the moral regeneration of the world.

I cannot do better than to quote here a passage from Dr. Paul Carus, editor of "The Monist," on "Monism not Mechanicalism" (Vol. II., p. 440). After distinguishing between *Zweck* and *Ziel, purpose* and *aim*, he says:

"The gravitating stone has no purpose, yet it has an aim. So the evolution of organized life is a natural process having a very definite aim. And this aim of the evolution of organized life is determined by factors of a very complex nature. One of these factors is almost imperceptible at the beginning, but it is of a constantly and rapidly growing importance; and this factor is the psychical element that appears with organized life. This factor is nothing supra-natural, nothing extra-natural, and yet it is not something material or mechanical. It is this factor which in its highest efflorescence changes aims into purposes, and with this change it creates again a new factor of evolution, which is the *purposive aspiration to conform to the world-order and thus to advance the further progress of mankind.* This aspiration is in one word called morality."

This is exactly the idea of Christianity—to implant "the purposive aspiration to conform to the world-order" in every human breast, and so to raise man to the place and to the activities assigned him in the evolutionary scheme; and it is no more and no less scientific in aim than evolution itself.

The scientific aim of ethics, which is the aim of moral evolution, if it were to be expressed in a single word, would not, I think, with the utilitarian philosophy, choose *happiness* as the term; for happiness is an introspective and self-centred conception. Nor does the *perfection* of Intuitionalism seem to be much better; for, although it has the secret implication of a norm or standard outside of self, yet perfection, like happiness, is introspective and self-centred, and both alike have a character of finality, a conception of completed attainment.

It may very well be that there is no single word entirely adequate to express the idea of an active rational determination of self toward the universally beneficent ends of evolution—to an onward, outward, upward progress in well-doing that never shall end—a progress

that all along its later course may be marked by an untarnished moral perfection and by unalloyed happiness. But a word needing as little adjustment as any other, and containing in itself the suggestion of all essential evolutionary ideas, is *achievement*—an eternal self-determined progress in active righteousness; a conception embodying the Aristotelian idea of "activity" as the *summum bonum;* a conception characteristic of Christianity, and one that must characterize Ethics before it can be thoroughly scientific in an evolutionary sense, by whatever term or terms it may most appropriately be expressed.

3. Christianity is scientific in its *methods.*

This, of course, does not signify that Christianity is a science, but merely that its methods, if collated, coördinated, and classified, would constitute the system appropriate to ethical science. It means that Christianity, with all its manifold facts, including its methods, is to Ethics what the earth, with its fossils, stratified rocks, etc., is to Geology, and what the stars in their courses are to Astronomy.

"Ethics is the science of right conduct and

character," or "the science of ideal humanity." It is plain that there can be but one science of Ethics, as there can be but one Astronomy and one Geology. And this ethical science, if it be true, must be based on a true conception of the nature of man. It must, for example, not form a statical conception of him, as though ideal humanity were something finished, which could be held up to view like a beautiful statue and admired in its passive perfections; but it must regard him as an actively evolutionary being—a being all of whose normal functions and duties are conditioned by a law of eternal progress. And this law of progress itself is to be regarded, not merely as a mysterious gravitation inherent in the constitution of man, and dragging him upward in spite of himself; not merely as a biological inheritance of tendencies derived from ancestors or from the organic life of society; but as being also and primarily an intelligent determination of self on rational grounds toward the goal, not of human progress merely, but also of human achievement—as Christ commanded his followers to subdue all nations to the sway of truth and righteousness. An

Ethics that fails thus to conceive of man is *pro tanto* false. Christianity, because its conception is wholly and consistently and in all respects that of a being who is evolutionary in all his powers, including his controlling rational will, and because its methods are thoroughly responsive to that conception, is scientific in its methods.

Christianity is scientific, for example, in its *methods of promoting the moral development of rightly disposed men.* It provides for surrounding them with an environment of influences favorable to moral expansion. It associates them together in churches where they have the support of sympathetic companionship. It provides for meetings of the churches at frequent stated intervals to listen to the instruction of competent teachers in all matters relating to the perfecting of righteousness; for other meetings where the members give expression to their views, feelings, and experiences, for the general good; and for still others in which, by a symbolic rite, they recall and keep in memory those divine realities by virtue of which we have received deliverance from the downward

trend of sin and been enabled to achieve the true life.

Christianity is scientific in providing a helpful environment, also, in the absence of fellow disciples. It gives us a manual of instruction for our guidance in all the work of life, and admonishes us to turn away, not only from wrong action, but also from wrong thoughts and wrong feelings and desires. We are enjoined, not only to banish hatred and lust and passion from our conduct, but not even to allow them a foothold in our minds or hearts; but whatsoever things are pure, lovely, and of good report, these we should ever "think" upon. And all needful themes for moral culture are suggested in the Bible. And we are taught to "pray without ceasing"; to be ever in communion with the Holy One "in whom we live and move and have our being," resting assured that he heareth us, and that, as the Searcher of hearts, he will be present in gracious power for our help even before the consciousness of need has voiced itself in our souls.

All this is scientific, because science tells us that human nature does not progress by leaps

and bounds, or merely as a result of abrupt volitions; but by a *gradual response to environment.* Christianity not only provides a law of duty and the evolutionary power to do it; but it also, recognizing our freedom, furnishes us the means of surrounding ourselves with a holy and helpful spiritual environment, which must gradually transform the very warp and woof of our spiritual life—our tastes, feelings, impulses, desires—and create within us holiness of character, precisely as the material environment determines modification of vegetable and animal organisms.

Again, Christianity is scientific in method by reason of its *aggressiveness against evil.* Aggression directed to the subordination of everything of a lower type is evolutionary, and therefore scientific; and, since it is evolutionary, it is a method of power and of success. Thus, many a defenseless woman has gone scatheless, bearing the message of salvation for lost sinners, into moral sinks of iniquity where, if simply "minding her own business," she would not have been safe for a moment. There is a moral dignity in aggressive righte-

ousness to which even the grossest sinners pay spontaneous reverence.

Again, Christianity is scientific in method by reason of its *doctrine of self-denial and self-sacrifice*. Science tells us that our higher powers should dominate the lower—the intellect should dominate the animal impulses, and the rational will should control both animal and intellectual powers. Christianity says exactly the same thing—the "spirit" should rule the "flesh." But the "flesh wars against the spirit," and therefore we should "crucify the flesh with its affections and lusts." We should "keep the body under." And that is all there is to this much decried doctrine of self-sacrifice—the elimination of positive evil, or the subordination of the lower to the higher good—the very essence of evolutionary ethics.

Christianity is scientific in method, once more, in the *means employed to win men from sin to righteousness*. The method, in general, is to accumulate influences tending to induce a decision of the reason and the will against the old life and in favor of a new and right life. The influence of truth, of personal example, of the love of God, of the certainty of

help from above in the upward course, the influence of the teachings of the Bible—all that can touch the conscience and stimulate to decision—are put at the disposal of Christian men, who are commissioned to go to worldly men and use their *personal influence* to win them.

And personal propagandism is the law of progress and of success in all human enterprise. The rational will of man in aggressive action is the grand characteristic evolutionary control in human society. The living man, employing and directing all influences toward the attainment of his purposes, contains within himself the secret of all progressive social movement. Unremitting agitation and proselytism subverted slavery; and the living missionary, carrying the glad tidings of salvation to a perishing world, is the one indispensable means of the world's moral regeneration.

4. Christianity is scientific in its *conception of normal society.*

Christianity does not regard all men as normal constituents of society. It rather conceives of a large class of men as "aliens" and "enemies" by reason of wicked works. And

in this conception it is evidently scientific. For it needs but little observation to prove that effort for the moral betterment of society is sure to be antagonized by a large element of the community—an element that may be counted on to include all habitués of liquor saloons, brothels, and gambling dens, together with all the criminal classes and a vast multitude of others, who, not having experienced, or if you please not having achieved, a reversal of the ruling moral purpose with which they were born into the world, are still involved in the counter-evolution, and are thus adverse to the moral progress of society, even though it be only by hanging as a dead weight and drag on the efforts of those who are trying to achieve reform.

The normal members of society, in the Christian view, are those who, recognizing their inherited depravity and sinfulness or lack of conformity to the evolutionary standard of life, and acknowledging their personal inability to achieve that standard, gladly welcome the canceling of their debt to the moral law for the "sins that are past," and undertake for the future to live as best they may the true life of

upward endeavor, relying always of course upon the continued forgiveness and help of the Power that made us for the upward life.

Such persons being the normal members of society, they are united into one body by the bonds of personal fellowship and coöperation on the basis of the common ethical interests of mankind; and united more profoundly still by the common life they all have through the vital spiritual connection of each one of them with the living God.

Thus we read, that "we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another;" that "Christ is the head over all things to the church, which is his body;" and that we are to "grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ, from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, . . . maketh increase of the body." All of which agrees with the evolutionary conception of the origin and unity of the human species, and with the biological doctrine that society is an organism.

But Christianity announces more distinctly than the yet immature science of Sociology,

or than Ethics, the *nature of the normal social bond.* According to most sociologists, the social organism consists of an interdependence and coöperation of men along the lines of *material* and *intellectual* interests; and, since they overlook the radically anti-social nature of sin (if not the fact itself of sin), they dilute their conception of society with various incongruous elements, as, for example, raising the competitions incident to industry into a state of war inherent in society, and even the craft of the fox into a system of deception that is normal among men. But Christianity says that antagonism and deception are anti-social—that they are sin—and that all men, being children of God, are brethren, and should *love* one another as brethren. As members of one body, they should strengthen and help, not fight and devour, one another. The methods in business that can properly be compared to the methods of cats and dogs in pursuit of a bone, as one writer picturesquely describes them, are not ultimate in beings endowed with a moral nature.

I think a radical fault of most sociological writers is, that they fail to recognize the fact

that society is normally ethical and that if ethical principles do not control there is a subversion of the normal order of society. They have given us biological sociologies, and biological principles are not ultimate. They are preliminary; and they are helpful. But the ultimate sociology will be based upon ethics—upon man's obligation to conform to the world-order, which is the highest principle in human nature, including within itself, not alone the obligation of obedience to the moral law and to God, the author of law; but also the obligation to love our fellow men even as we love ourselves, and to labor for their well-being even as we labor for our own.

Christianity announces the highest scientific principle in the *distribution of social functions.* We read, "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." "And all members have not the same office." "And God hath set some in the church, first, apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers . . ." That is to say, *the first and greatest gifts in society* are those of the men who are most efficient in winning others to lives that are morally right and in building them up in righteousness.

The distribution of social functions is usually conceived of, however, and in the present stage of social evolution, perhaps necessarily so, as based upon the ability of individuals to supply *material or intellectual* needs of society—which are normal and necessary functions, though not the highest. We can perceive a decided progress in moral tone from the lowest to the highest functions.

The man who manufactures boots and shoes for the market labors primarily for himself. If he is helping others at the same time, it is because by helping others he can help himself. There is no philanthrophic motive in his choice of the business. He may be an honorable man and give a good article on principle. But if in any class of social activities the cat and dog theory of social responsibility is liable to prevail, it is here, in industrial enterprise, where men labor for others with a paramount reference to their own advantage.

Those who minister to the *intellectual* development of mankind stand on quite a different plane. They are contributing a *permanent* blessing upon their fellows, and one whose rewards to the laborer are in general hardly

adequate. The moral element in the motive to such labor is considerable, and may very often be characteristic of it.

But the labor directed to the *winning of men to righteousness*, especially that which seeks the uplifting of degraded and heathen populations, pays nothing in permanent material advantage, and is beset with many conditions of physical and moral inconvenience that make it very trying. Those who engage in it have nothing else to look forward to; and, as a rule, they wish for nothing else. It is their reward to see their fellow men saved from degradation and sin and transformed into upright worthy characters. For this they often pay their own money and give their time. This species of work, as it involves the largest recognition of human brotherhood and the most unequivocal expression of human love, is undoubtedly the highest order of human activity. It is work belonging to the dominance of ethical conceptions in individual and social life.

But the highest grade of social service is not the only grade relative to which Scripture agrees with science in pronouncing it a normal

social function. In fact, the dicta of science on this head are but a faint and distant echo of the doctrine, promulgated near two thousand years ago, that all the gifts are necessary, and that even the least of them, if it be exercised with a due regard to its nature and to its place in the total order of things, is not only legitimate, but it may be exalted into a truly ethical service, and may in this character become as beneficent and as far-reaching in evolutionary potency as that of the herald of moral regeneration himself. Science but reiterates the teaching of Scripture, that every member in the social organism is essential to the well-being of every other member and of the organism as a whole, and that it may often come to pass that those members commonly esteemed the least shall receive the more abundant honor because of the greater service.

CHAPTER XX

Conclusion

MY argument is thus substantially completed. Identifying the control of society with evolution, it recognizes in the different stages of evolution the various essential characteristics of control—physical, chemical, vital, rational; it finds in the mutual relations of the stages of evolution a clew to the true subordination of the several species of control; in the unity of evolution it finds the principle that discloses the coherence and philosophic unity of control; and in the latest and highest stage of evolution it sees the meeting together, self-conscious and self-determined on both sides, of control subjective and Control Objective—of the rational will of man and the rational will of the evolutionary Power—the latter containing the norm and the efficiency of all evolution, including the evolutionary or ethical life of man. I observe in conclusion :—

1. The doctrine I have outlined *harmonizes science and religion.* Or, rather, it exhibits the harmony that has always existed, though it has not always been perceived. And this it does simply by carrying the doctrine of evolution through to its natural end in the rational will of man on precisely the same principles that have characterized evolution from the beginning. It proceeds upon the scientific assumption that nature's methods are uniform and are to be depended upon ; that, as in the past, a new stage of evolution has always been marked by the introduction of a *new species of control operating by new and higher laws* than those previously in force, so the advent of the last and highest stage of all—the evolution of man—has been signalized by the introduction of the highest species of control—different, of course, from all that was before it, and not to be derived from anything previously existing, but to be judged, like gravitation, chemical affinity, and life, by the incontestible facts of its own self-evidencing action.

Accordingly, judging the phenomena of rational will by the same theory of knowledge that we employ in judging the phenomena of

physics or of chemistry—testing them by their coherence with each other and with evolution and by their persistence in consciousness—we find them, as they are interpreted and supplemented by the teaching of the Christian Scriptures, crystallizing into an evolutionary system of Ethics. Or, rather, we find these phenomena taking shape as Ethical Science.

2. That *the religion of the New Testament is essentially scientific*, appears, not only from what we have already seen in the foregoing chapters, but also from the application of various *tests* of scientific truth. Our entire discussion shows that the claims of religion *admit of verification.* Its great claim—that it enables men to live an evolutionary life—is verified continually by millions of people. And the beauty of it is, that any human being who *will* may put it to the test, and prove the truth or falsity of the claim to his own satisfaction. The great purpose of religion is to give men an *experience* that will be self-evidencing; and it is every man's own fault if he does not know the competency or incompetency of religion to the accomplishment of this purpose every whit as surely as he knows the *modus operandi*

of a lever or the action of an acid on litmus paper.

A test of scientific truth is the ability to *predict* the effects of its application. Christianity meets this test as well as any other non-mathematical science—biology, for example. No biologist can predict the *details* in the working of biological laws. He can tell that the child of a human being will probably be human; but that it will be born alive or with all its faculties, or what the color of its hair and eyes will be, or what its temperament, he cannot certainly predict. And just so it is certain that if Christianity is consistently lived and intelligibly proclaimed in any community whatever for any great length of time, it will win converts. And it is certain that any man, whatever his past may have been, who takes Christianity as the law of his life, will be a good citizen. We can be perfectly sure that he will be on the up-grade morally; though as to the exact quality, the defects, and the rate of his progress—the details of his ethical complexion —Christianity cannot pretend to foresee. And in this limitation Christianity is at one with many of the sciences. For it is only in this

general way that prevision is possible in history or sociology, for example, or even in botany or geology.

3. That *Christianity is rightly to be identified with the teaching of the Bible*, and not with the doctrines and usages of any religious body whatever, may be variously shown.

Roman Catholicism, identified with Christianity by Comte and Spencer, does not represent the doctrines or the life of Christianity as it was promulgated by Christ and his immediate followers; and in the essential nature of its control it is a *reversion to an anterior and lower type*. Twice, at least, in the history of the world the essential principles of democracy have been within reach of mankind, if civilization had been evolved up to the point of appreciating and seizing the opportunity—once, when Israel rejected the Theocracy and demanded a king; and again, when Christ embodied the doctrine of universal brotherhood in a conquering church. But the time was not yet ripe. The world was too dark. The minds of men were too little wonted to self-restraint and the dominance of reason. Reaction came; and sacerdotalism in religion,

answering to militancy in the state, prevailed yet fifteen hundred years before the most advanced of men were ready to welcome the "glad tidings" heralded by the Man of Galilee.

Sociologists like those just named, seeing the gradual disintegration and decay of ecclesiasticism in recent years, have announced the passing of Christianity, especially as an institional and organic system. If they would but lay aside their biological theories of human progress long enough to enable them to catch a glimpse of the *facts* that are multiplying before their eyes, they would see that the principles of the New Testament, living in the individualism of self-determined freemen, are the mighty power of evolution in the world to-day. They would see that Christianity is alive in a larger and grander sense than ever before, and that under its magical touch the dead and dying civilizations of the earth are feeling the thrill of a new life pulsating within them.

And they would see that this life and power are not altogether disembodied. It has its visible forms. And, although these forms are as yet many—although they are wholly lack-

ing in the unity of the old-time hierarchy—still, no very shrewd observation is needed to reveal the existence, amid all this apparent confusion, of the vital elements and beginnings of a better unity. The old organization is dying, not because faith is dying, but because men are living, and because the forms appropriate to intellectual childhood are not the forms appropriate to manhood. And while the unity of organization begotten of the authority of a traditional church over the minds and consciences of men is passing away; the unity begotten of the intelligent self-determination of men toward the ethical goal of the world-process is but just entering the consciousness of humanity. It will grow in proportion as the conviction of Christian men grows that they ought to coöperate in the moral regeneration of the world.

4. That Christianity, or the doctrine of the Bible, is the doctrine which, from the point of view of evolutionary science, must be regarded as a setting forth of the true theory and practice of *Ethics*—argues beyond a doubt that the practical system of Bible teaching, including its characteristic features—the deity of

Christ, the incarnation, the vicarious death, human sin, regeneration, the church, heaven and hell—*should be made a permanent feature in the curriculum of all our public institutions of learning.*

Undoubtedly this is impracticable at the present time. But the question is simply this: Since Ethics is a standard branch in all the schools; are we to teach a system that goes to the root of morality, or one that merely skims the surface?

The objection will of course be urged, that *religion* is not to be taught in the schools. The answer is, that *science is* to be taught, by the common consent of all sociologists. Education in the sciences, the great means of social progress, is their doctrine. And, according to the evolutionary conception, Ethics is the highest and most important of all the sciences, the one most of all involved in the progressive development of society. But, as we have seen, the ethics of Christianity is the ethical system of evolution; and reason and experience prove, as conclusively as reason and experience can prove anything, that there is no ethical evolution for mankind save in and

through the promulgation and general acceptance of Christianity. Education in ethical science, therefore, is education in Christianity. And therefore the most important of all the sciences must be ruled out of the schools, or Christianity must be ruled in. Such, at least, is the dictum of consistency.

It would be urged, also, that if Christianity is to be taught, Buddhism and Confucianism would have the same right. There is no doubt that this objection may indefinitely postpone the teaching of Christian Ethics in the *public* schools. The answer to it, however, is obvious. Nothing is to be taught that is not scientific. If Buddhism, or Confucianism, or Spiritualism, or Christian Science, or Mormonism, or any other ism, can *furnish the evidences of its practical evolutionary power in human society;* then it is *pro tanto* shown to be true and scientific and entitled to recognition.

I incline to the opinion that Roman Catholicism is the only sharply defined historic system that can establish a claim of this sort; and the fact that its usefulness has been characteristic of a militant stage of social evolution,

and that for the last four hundred years it has been largely obstructive and retrogressive, will go far toward invalidating its claim. And the character of the civilizations, as in Spain, Portugal, Austria, Mexico, where Romanism has had time to work itself out to its logical ends, will prove conclusively that the good it has done, though great, is incidental to the system and appropriate to a less advanced civilization than our own, while the evil is in the essential nature of the system itself.

5. That cosmic evolution—a process extending over millions of years and comprehending the sum total of all that falls within the range of human cognition; a process characterized in the past by movements so stupendous as utterly to baffle human thought: —that cosmic evolution should come at last to depend upon the directive wisdom of the human mind and upon the propelling energy of the human will, and should nevertheless still retain its character as *cosmic* evolution :— is a conception so astounding, and so foreign to the experience of any single human being, that, although philosophy, science, and religion

unite to pronounce it true, it would not be strange if the human intellect should halt, perplexed and sometimes paralyzed, before the contemplation, especially in some of its practical aspects. Two practical principles, however, are so fundamental and so characteristic as not to be mistaken; and, at the same time, so important as not to be lost sight of without missing entirely the evolutionary doctrine of social control.

First, rational will, as control, *is the reason of man*, and its methods in social evolution are the methods by which the human reason everywhere and in all things compasses results. There is, first of all, the clear and comprehensive apprehension of the *end* to be attained, and then the devising of *ways and means* and the due adjustment of them to the attaining of that end—the end in this case being the moral regeneration of the world; and the means, the preaching and adequate exemplification of the gospel of "our God and Saviour Jesus Christ" to all mankind.

Secondly, rational will, as control, is the *will of man;* and its methods are the methods

of unconquerable persistence and perseverance —a self-determination which is a self-conscious appropriation of the momentum of the world-process itself, precisely as the ethical conception which prescribes the end and the plan of the evolutionary life is a self-conscious rational transcript of the world-order.

But the reinforcing of the will is a matter of motives. And these, in the supreme work of human regeneration, are to be found in our apprehension of the eternal verities—the immortality of the soul, and the immanent almighty operation, the unsearchable wisdom, the manifested will, and the judicial righteousness of the Power of evolution. Obviously, the strenuousness of our evolutionary endeavors will be proportional to the clearness and the strength of these convictions. As it is written, " According to your faith be it unto you." And we are assured that, if faith shall dare to mount so high as to brave the cost and "ask" it; we may even receive the heathen for our inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for our possession. Whereby, the partial and fragmentary stage of ethical

achievement shall pass, and the truly *cosmic* scope of ethical evolution appear to view.

As I draw this discussion to a close, I am inclined to leave with the reader a thought that, as the argument has advanced, has produced in my mind a growing feeling of wonder and awe possibly not unlike that which came to the Seer of Königsberg from the contemplation of the starry heavens above and of the moral law within him. The ignorant fishermen of Galilee nearly two thousand years ago proclaimed a system of ethics exactly adapted to round out and complete on the strictest principles of science the modern doctrine of evolution. But the modern philosophers, who have originated and promulgated the doctrine of evolution and who might naturally be supposed to know all the possibilities of the doctrine, if any one may know them, have utterly failed to follow it out to its legitimate culmination in a consistent ethical system. And now I would like to leave to the one who can answer it the question: Whence did those ignorant fishermen derive their wonderful

system of ethics?—a system of which it may truly be said that it is more scientific and more evolutionary—more thoroughly in tune with the most advanced thought of the present age—than any ethical system the philosophers have been able to propound from Plato and Aristotle even down to this twentieth century of light.

INDEX

Acceleration, in cosmic control, 16-17; in individual control, 41-43; in social control, 98-100; of human progress, 122; of Christian achievement, 228-29, 232.

American Indians, mission to, 226.

Animalism, in counter-evolution, 111; and atomic theory, 192; not evolutionary, 193-94.

Atomic Theory, alternative of theism, 21, 23; explained, 179, 180; called monistic, 181; exponents, 187; doctrine of God, 190; of man, 190; of immortality, 191; unpopular, 192-93, 198, 233.

Bible, rational, xiii.; textbook of theism, 188, 236, 269; and criticism, 188-89; in all languages, 216; and public schools, 271-74.

Biology, and current sociology, xi., 18; laws, 46, 73, 116, 245; conditional dominance of laws, 116, 119-20; sociology not ultimate, 122-24; explanation of religion inadequate, 243-45.

Burma, result of missions, 224.

Carus, Dr. Paul, evolution of morality, 249.

Causation, and control, 8; unit Cause inferred, 19-23; invariable, 50, 51.

Chinese, martyrs, 169; and Christianity, 225.

Christianity, key to knowledge, xi.-xiii.; evolutionary mission, 207-09; organization, 216-18; and education, 234-35; is doctrine of Bible, 236, 269; scientific, 236-64; practical, 237; satisfies conditions of knowledge, 238-43; Spencer's error, 238, 242-44; aim, 248-51; method, 251-57; conception of society, 257-61; distribution of social functions, 261-64; alleged decay, 270; and public schools, 271-74.

Church, organization, 210, 216-19, 270-71; the ideal, 237-38.

Comte, Auguste, cosmic philosophy, xviii., xix.; scheme of naturalism, 212-13; misconception of Christianity, 238.

Conscience, nature, 55; in individual control, 70, 71, 97-98, 101; grounded in immortality, 168-71.

Control, defined, 9; subversion, 105-28; restoration, 129-278.
Control, Cosmic, nature, xi., 3-24; not causal, 8; four species, 9; a progression, 10; the later aggressively dominant, 11; decrease in physical force, 13-14; now psychic, 14-15; a residuary sphere, 15; an accelerating movement, 16-17; present character, 17; 274-76; a unity, 19.
Control, Individual, nature, 25-55; threefold, 37; a progression, 38; later forms dominant, 39; narrowing of direct efficiency, 39; a residuary sphere, 40; acceleration, 41; indirect action, 44; self-mastery, 45; over physical environment, 47-48; possibility of subversion, 53; relations to social control, 93-103.
Control, Social, nature, xv.; 57-103; legislatures subject to, 70; exception, 71; integration of individual wills, 80-87; compatible with freedom, 84-86; imperfect operation, 86; maintenance, 88-92; relations to individual control, 93-103; dominates individual control, 94; narrower field, 95; residuary sphere, 96-97; acceleration, 98-100.
Control, Supracosmic, inference from evolution, 19-23; two theories, 21, 23, 178-85; atomic force, 179-82; a personal God, 182-85; the theories compared, 186-214.
Conversion, necessity, 140; radical and difficult, 141-43.
Coöperation, in social bond, 68; implies organization, 68-69; informal, 81; formal, 82; presupposes ethical development, 83-84; freedom and, 84-86; normally cosmic, 145-47; of Christians, 210, 216-19, 270-71.
Counter-evolution, nature, 105-28; outcome of freedom, xii.; is anti-evolutionary action, 109-11; habit, 111-12; subversion of faith, 113; organization of evil, 113-14; transmission of evil, 114-16; universality, 117; result of "fall," 118-20; consequences, 121-26; doctrine of hell, 171-75.

Education, importance, 77-78; moral, 79; essential to social control, 88-89; public schools, 89; private schools, 90; literature, 90; inculcation of ideals, 91; great evolutionary method, 200; naturalistic scheme, 212-13; borrowed from theism, 234-35.
Environment, control by rational will, 47-49; nature,

52-53; in regeneration of society, 128; in counter-evolution, 172; in Christian growth, 253-55; in Christian propagandism, 256-57.
Ethics, scientific now possible, 79; ultimate nature, 124; Spencer's criticism, 216; aim, 250; nature, 251-53; and sociology, 260-61; and Scriptures, 266-67; and public schools, 271-74; historic problem, 277.
Evolution, doctrine incomplete, xi., xii.; is cosmic philosophy, xviii.-xx.; definition, 3; outlined, 4-6; four periods, 6, 7; inference from unity, 19-21; of individual, 27-36; irresistible, 51, 134-35; of society, 59-79; of socius, 60-61; of social bond, 62-65; auxiliary to ethics, 79; resistance normal, 107-08; abnormal resistance, 109; the prevailing power, 121-22, 131-36; human cooperation, 138-39; 148-49, and immortality, 151-53, 176; moral, 212; naturalism inadequate, 213-14; of missionary work, 228; and knowledge, 242; of morality, Carus, 249.

Faith, in good subverted, 113; erroneous conception, 158; basis of certification, 159-61.
Fall, very early, 118; evolution accounts for, 119; counter-evolution a necessary result, 119-20.
Fijians, and Christianity, 221.
Fiske, John, cosmic philosophy, xix.; evolution now psychical, 14-15; on immortality, 156-57, 166, 177; on natural theology now possible, 159; a theist, 188.
Freedom, Spencer's view defective, xi.; contains possibility of sin, xii., 53-54; denial of, 32; usual ground of denial, 33-34; social integration compatible with, 84-86.

Garos, mission to, 223.
God, in modern thought, 21, 23; atomic theory, 179-82; 190; theistic theory, 182-85, 191; Jesus Christ, 202-03.

Haeckel, Ernst, monism of, 181-82, 187, 190-91.
Heaven, 175.
Hell, 171-75.

Ideals, and individual evolution, 30; of socius, 74; in control, 91; lost, 113, 142; true life a pursuit of, 163; of manhood, 170; of church, 237-38.
Immortality, essential to moral evolution, 152; A. R. Wallace on, 152-53; demonstration not essential, 155; scientific certitude, 155-56,

161-62; John Fiske on, 156-58; proofs of, 163-76; ideals, 163; the best believe in, 164; belief universal, 165-66; belief evolutionary, 167; basis of manhood, 168-71; and counter-evolution, 171-75; and morality, 176; belief persistent, 177; climax of skepticism, 177; naturalism on, 191.

Individual, an evolution, 27-36; physically, 28; intellectually, 29; morally, 29; moral ideals, 30; progress toward autonomy, 32-33; historical development, 34-35; normally evolutionary, 43; the socius, 60-61; co-operation in society, 81-82; residuary control in, 96-97; creator of society, 98, 101; not stage of evolution, 100; morality of, 102; moral deadness, 115, 125-27; conversion necessary, 127, 140-43; immortality of, 154-77.

Japanese, and Christianity, 225.

Jesus Christ, said to be God, 202, 203, 208; mission of, to save from sin, 202-05; commission to his followers, 207-09; his doctrine of social evolution, 211-12.

Kant, Immanuel, xix., 50, 277; on immortality, 175.

Karens, mission to, 225.

Man, last product of evolution, 6, 7; conquest of nature, 47-49; normal conduct, 52; attaining maturity, 61; principle of morality in, 102; the first, and sin, 118; theistic theory, 183-84, 191; atomic theory, 180-81, 190-91.

Matter, atomic theory, 179-81, 190; theistic theory, 183.

Mikirs, and missionaries, 224.

Missionary Work, obligation of, 143-44, 146-47; skepticism respecting, 146; difficulty, 148-51; doctrine of immortality essential, 152, 167; the commission, 207; evolutionary, 209; organization for, 210, 211; results, 218-28; nature of among savages, 225-26; discordant elements, 229-30; acceleration of, 231-32; naturalism and, 232-34.

Monism, of Haeckel, 181; of theism, 184, 185 note.

Morality, traditional, 30-31; rational, 31, 78-79; conscience, 55; in social control, 83-84; grounded in immortality, 152-53, 176; evolution of, 249; aim achievement, 250-51.

Motives, in moral evolution, 276.

Naturalism, alternative of theism, 21, 23; unpopular,

192-93, 199; on immortality, sin, etc., 196; evolutionary method, 200, 212-13; no adequate results, 232-34; education a borrowed feature, 234.
Nature, transformed, 49; change necessary in man's, 127-28.

Organism, Social, nature of, 64, 73; law of in degeneration, 116.

Philosophy, and theism, xiii.; and spiritual realities, xvii.; cosmic, is scientific, xviii.-xx.; traditional idea, xix.; Spencer's, xx. note; and First Cause, 50; ally of traditional morality, 79; on atomic forces, 107; and immortality, 158-59; and ethics, 277-78.
Prayer, answer to, 206-07.
Progress, in American society, 76-78; acceleration, 100, 121-22, 133-34; of gospel, 177, 228; test of truth, 191-92; law of human, 252, 257.

Rational Will, last form of cosmic control, 10, 245; is present control, 14-15; 17; 257; instantaneous in action, 41-42; potency of, 43; indirect action, 44-45; dominates biological laws, 46, 73; dominates physical environment, 47-48; transforms nature, 49; relations to supracosmic control, 50-55, 138, 147; and social unit, 61; and social bond, 62, 64-65; acquaintance of socii, 65-66; fellowship, 67; coöperation, 68; social, dominates legislatures, 69-72; social, nature, 80; how social constituted, 81-83; moral evil abdication of, 116, 119-20, 122-23; prayer and, 206; completes evolution, 245; is cosmic, 275-76.
Regeneration, necessity, 127-28.
Religion, and science, xiii., 158, 236-64, 266-68, 271-74. (*See* under "Christianity" and "Science.")
Roman Catholicism, and Christianity, 238; a reversion, 269-71, 273-74.

Sandwich Islands, mission to, 221.
Science, and religion, xiii., 158, 236-64, 266-68, 271-74; defined, xvi., xvii., 62; and cosmic philosophy, xviii., xix.; ally of morality, 79; and missions, 220; nature of knowledge, 238-43; nature of facts, 243.
Sin, nature, 54, 109-11, 113-14; origin, 118-19, 194; universal, 124-25; moral death, 125-27; punishment, 171-75,

196; effect, moral incapacity, 195; natui lism denies, 196, 198-99.
Social Bond, is rational will, 62, 65-68; evolution of, 62-65; normal spirit, 260.
Societies, constitute Society, 69; classified, 75-78; missionary, 218-19.
Society, an aggregate, 59, 69; the unit, 60-61; the bond, 62-69; cosmic, 74; an organism, 259, 264.
Sociology, current is biological, 18, 122-24, 260-61; ultimate, ethical, 18, 122-24, 260-61.
Socius, evolution of, 60-61; ideal, 74-75, 100; normal and abnormal, 257-59.
Spencer, Herbert, system incomplete, xi.; author of cosmic philosophy, xviii.; scientist and philosopher, xix., xx. note; definition of evolution, 3; his sociology biological, 18; motion resultant of forces, 107; climax of skepticism, 177; a monist, 181, 187; on Christian ethics, 216; doctrine of knowledge, 238-43; misconception of Christianity, 238, 243-44, 269-71.

Telugus, new civilization, 221.
Theism, and naturalism, 21, 23; theory of God, 182, 191; matter, 183; man, 183-84, 191; monistic, 184; divine, self-limitation, 184-85; Bible, text-book of, 188-89, 236, 269-71; scheme of social evolution, 199-212; its practical system evolutionary, 215-19; its cosmic success, 219-32, 233; scientific, 236-64, 266-68.
Theology, Natural, possible, John Fiske on, 159.
Toro, Christianity in, 222.

Uganda, and missions, 222.
United States, illustrates normal society, 69-72; materialistic society, 75-77; high ethical development in, 83-84.

Wallace, Alfred R., on immortality, 152.
Ward, Lester F., atomic theory, 187; practical scheme, 212, 213.

DATE DUE

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN HM106.W554 1903
Wilkin, Georg Control in evolution :
3 0645 0004 2415 6